



DEIS - Public Release Comments

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
Public Hearing Comments						
1	12/9/08		Brake	Tony	<p>My name is Tony Brake and neighborhood is Sable El Toro (phonetic), we live on East Montview (phonetic) Boulevard. And we use I-70, obviously to go about anywhere we need to go. My immediate impression and actually it reinforces the thought that I've already put into this project as I've looked at it is that the cheapest is the best here and I don't know how other people feel about these high occupancy vehicle lanes but I see them not being used. I see them using resources that are paid for and they're not effectively being used. I don't know about the strings that the federal government has on these things where they require them to be built in order to get the federal contribution, that's something that needs to be considered. But, as far as from a practical standpoint, I do not see these toll lanes, if you will, as being effective, cost effective or productive. They just seem to take lanes away that never get used.</p> <p>One of the main things I want to point out is that when you take a detour like that, realigning of the I-70, it introduces some bad curves in there folks. Whether they're gradualized or not, they're still curves and when the weather is bad, when we have ice and snow, it's a safety factor. It's a hazard. Anyway you look at it. And then it makes your commute, your drive to downtown from the east side or back and forth, etc., it makes it longer everyday. And it puts out more air pollution into the air. So every time you drive, every time we go to downtown or to wherever we're going, we're actually burning more fuel because we make that detour. So, I'm definitely against the realignment of I-70.</p> <p>Historically it's been there, everybody counts on it being there, everybody who lives in the area. That area is depressed. On the north side it might even create some urban revitalization if we tore down some of that junk. As long as we give the people their honest value when we go in and condemn their properties, if we give them what it's worth, then I think they'll probably be good with it. So clearly --</p> <p>I've got one minute left, thank you. So I think you're getting my drift of what I'd like to see. It's much cheaper, it's the cheapest alternative that we've seen up here. Leave the alignment the same. Do not put in any lanes that everyone cannot use. Lanes that everybody can use. Forget the nonsense about having these empty lanes that nobody's using. Use them all and keep the alignment the same. Move the thing to the north so that you're not tearing out all of those expensive businesses and you're done. We can't afford anything else. Look at the economy. Thank you, you're beautiful.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
					<p>My name is Kenton Circle and I'm here just because of curiosity. My neighborhood is Aurora. I live in southeast Aurora, however, I did work about 20 years in the neighborhood of I-70 and Vasquez and I worked there while the re-did the deck of the elevated portion. And it seems to me that I-70 needs to get out of there.</p> <p>Now, I know that's different from this gentleman that just spoke but you've got some considerations here. I think there ought to be a strong consideration of keeping the National Western where it is. But allowing them for expansion to do what they want to do. They're talking about moving because they don't have enough room, they don't have -- they have to shorten their activities in order to keep it with the time and so on. I think that strong consideration ought to be in the National Western, allow them to expand. Also I think, need to get I-70 away from Purina.</p>	Public Hearing via

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
2	12/9/08		Ciric	Kenton	<p>Also another point I have is the Pilot truck stop at Vasquez is mostly undersize. You back trucks up getting into that truck stop. Now, if you do away with the Pilot truck stop, you need to consider, well do we still need the truck stop? These kind of things to me need to be addressed and when you address the pilot truck stop you're, right now, CDOT is already relooking at the Ward Road truck stop. So you've got a lot of considerations for whatever you're going to do with I-70 through this area. I would think that the City of Denver ought to have a lot of input on this.</p> <p>Down to one minute, okay. And I, even possibly, I have not seen in any of your considerations, go north of the mousetrap. And you may have not talked about that but anyway, now, when you get over to I-25, go elevated all the way to Vale (phonetic) and you eliminate that problem as far as the -- that's facetious, but anyway, these are my concerns. Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment.</p>	transcript
3	12/9/08		McGuire	Aidan	<p>I would like to see the I-70 stay on the same tract it is on now. I own property that would be impacted by 4 & 6. My land is located at 2655 E 52nd Ave. If 4 or 6 is elected, my property would be cut in half. I own 11.25 acres. I have an industrial storage area and this is my main source of income for my family.</p> <p>I also own a section of land at 5400 Monroe St - 10.25 acres. This property would have less impact. It is located in the north side of 56th Ave and runs from Adams St to Harrison St. 6 blocks long. Your maps of 4 & 6 show a frontage road where 56th Ave is now. I am not sure what access I would then have to my property and if 4 & 6 would want to have any part of my property.</p>	Public Hearing via comment form
4	12/10/08		Jagger	Lydia	<p>Hi, I'm Lydia Jagger. I live in the Tiffany subdivision, 55 --</p> <p>I live on 5500 Monaco, just down the street where the one alternative would be. There's a bunch of homes and businesses in there and this would affect all of us. And really don't want it there. And I drove past I-70, I drove past 270 in the evenings. You have two different parking lots. All you would be doing is combining the mess and like if you went right down the street from me, that the noise, the fumes, everything, it would just --</p> <p>MR. BEMELEN: Real quick, are you talking the realignment options?</p> <p>Um-hum. I'm thoroughly against them.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
5	12/10/08		Serna	Guillermo	<p>Guillermo Serna, Paxton Street, Commerce City, Colorado. I think that you can do anything you want as long as you leave it where it's at. You already made the mistake of building that there once and now you want to make another mistake by bringing it towards Commerce City. We have an elementary school that's going to be affected because you're going to have more noise there. Are you going to -- you say mitigation or whatever the word is, are you going to move that school and place it somewhere else so that our children can have the opportunity of learning well? Are you going to assist the people that have to move when they have to move and you buy them out if they have a home? And it's a whole neighborhood that you're talking about. The other part is, you say that you're looking for money. You know that there's going to be the money for it. Otherwise, you wouldn't be doing it President-Elect, now that you don't want to spend all that money on 70, that's another thing. You may want to spend it for the people that want to go up the mountain to ski or come down the mountain.</p> <p>Or the people that come from the airport that want to go up the mountain for recreation. There's a lot of things that go into this. But Commerce City right now, we have 70, we have 285, we have 276, we have 76, we have 470 plus the railroads. All of it going to Denver. Come on Denver.</p> <p>That's enough. How much more do you want us to give? Our community provides a lot and it's about time that you take responsibility and build right where it's at. You already ruined one elementary there. I was there when you started building it. We cross that area all the time. There was a lot of promises that were made that have never been completed.</p> <p>Fifteen seconds, you know, eight years ago, all of this was brought up and it fell through the cracks. And most likely, it's going to fall through the cracks because you don't have the aspects of our community here. You have, right now, people that can come.</p> <p>I sure will. The people can not be here and have input because both of them are working. The time that you pick is wrong. Thank you very much.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
					<p>Thank you. Can I see the slide on the cost of the various alternatives again? Because I remember at a council meeting about three months ago, it seemed that the cost of any one of the northern lumps or bumps was going to be about \$3 or \$400 million more than it would be to continue along the existing alignment. I guess I'm not able to see that, that well to see what this says now but I'm thinking that it's still going to cost more to go up north than it is to go along the existing alignment. Somewhere in the tune of about \$3 or \$400 million to build this bump at I-70 up north. Three or four hundred million dollars. We're a billion and a half short in this state in transportation funding. That would be \$3 to \$400 hundred million that would be absolutely wasted. We can use \$150 million of that to expand the size of 270 which as, one of the previous speakers said it's just a parking lot at most of the time during the day. I was standing up on the new flyover from 270 onto 1-76 about three months ago when it opened with Russ Dorrs and I said, "Russ, take a look down here.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
6	12/10/08	Commerce City	Benson	Jim	<p>That's where you can spend this extra \$3 or \$400 million. Don't just realign I-70 and waste that money. Do something with it that we can all use that's going to alleviate the traffic problems." So maybe we won't have a parking lot at I-70 or 270. That's where that money ought to be spent. If it's an alternative three, makes I-70 a toll road, I have no problem with toll roads. There's going to be an alternative, you either take the toll lane or you take the general purpose lane. You want to go faster, you pay the toll. You still have the alternative. It's not strictly a toll road --</p> <p>-- Like E-470 would be, you have the alternative. So I'm all for alternative three. I'm only speaking for myself, not the City Council. City Council hasn't really taken a formal vote on this. I can only speak for myself tonight. But the cost alone is such a major -- \$3 or \$400 million dollars. I can't even, I've asked people why is this alternative going north even being proposed.</p> <p>I really never have gotten a big answer. I'd like to know what the impact of Purina is. Purina's got to move someplace for this to be realigned.</p> <p>And what I would say is, if Purina needs a place to move, we would welcome them in Commerce City. Thank you.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
7	12/10/08	Commerce City	Drotar	Reba	<p>You may call me what you will. You know I just heard you say -- and I appreciate that you're coming here to talk to us about this and that this is your job. And so my job as Councilwoman of Commerce City and long-term resident is I'm going to fight this realignment as much as we fought for the Rocky Mountain arsenal because it's that important to us. And you just said that the impacts that the slights of the impacts are going to be comparable. No, to the citizens of Commerce City there is no comparison. This will simply be another huge negative for our city. And actually it'll be the last -- what a kick in the pants for us. We have already suffered, we have carried the United States with the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. In fact, that was the world. That was Japan and Hitler. We have already given. In fact, this town had more people die in Vietnam than any other city in the state. This is wrong and I'm going to fight it. The entire region has spent enormous amounts of time and money and effort to build the San Creek Regional Greenway and to make it really beautiful.</p> <p>That will pollute it as we know because we have Highway 85 and the air monitoring systems on the high school show us clearly that it's the pollution from the cars, not even the refinery that was overwhelming there. With 270 and 70 coming through, you will completely pollute us. Not just with what we're breathing --</p> <p>All right. Let me see, this is just an unconscionable thing. Yes, we have one of the nation's biggest refineries here. Homeland Security should not allow you to put another highway by this refinery because it also is a confluence of railroads, east and west in the United States. I have a lot more to say and I'll be writing volumes to you and you have my guarantee, I will fight this with the people of Commerce City.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
8	12/10/08	Commerce City	McEldowney	Jason	<p>I'm fortunate that I get to follow Councilman Drotar Councilwoman Drotar, I would like to echo her comments. I think this needs to be visited very, very carefully. Obviously Mr. Benson cited the costs, the obvious increased costs for the norther alignment. I've tried to step back and look at this objectively and understand where there could be a benefit for Commerce City in this alignment and I don't see it. None of the options show me necessarily, an increased opportunity for our businesses or residence and I think as Councilman, Councilwoman Drotar suggested that this city's given quite a bit in its history. To be able to reuse the alignment that exists at present, expand that, reinforce that, makes a lot more sense. I do have a question about the comparable impacts at some point in the future when we do ultimately expand 270 and how the impact through the portion of the quarter where you would join the existing 270 alignment might be affected. In other words, we don't want to see that alignment but we obviously know that 270 may expand at some point.</p> <p>I'm trying to get my head around, are we just delaying the inevitable? I don't want to see the realignment but I want to understand if the eventual impact might be as bad. I don't know that I can say what Councilwoman Drouder said as well and I will stop at that point. Thanks.</p> <p>My question is, if the northern alignment were selected, option four or six, the traffic volumes through the section that would join the existing 270 alignment, would that be comparable if in an alternative scenario, I-70 remains at east west and 270 is actually expanded at some future point, would those future traffic volumes on an expanded 270 be similar to a hybrid of I-70 and 270, how's that?</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
9	12/10/08		Anderson	Daisy	Hi, I'm Daisy Anderson. I live at 6470 East 53rd Way. If the 270 project does go on, that means that it's going to be my house and my property and my business. I've been there, I've worked very hard for 16 years to (inaudible) and now they want to try to take it away. And I just don't think that it's fair because we work so hard to keep up Commerce City and to make it what it is. And you want to keep adding and adding and adding but it's not fair to us because then we lose what we worked so hard for. Thank you.	Public Hearing via transcript
10	12/10/08		Sater	Don	I'm Don Sater, and I would just like to make a comment on the I-70 over there. And I still think it would be a lot better for just going on the north side of it and make it wider there, because to go through way over here, you hit over by Commerce City by SunCor and all of that, and come down through it and his 270, because it would be a big bottleneck. It's already that way now, so why make it that much more when I-70 will run into it, you have to have a lot of lanes, and it would still be a bottleneck. So I just don't agree that way, I think it's a lot better to stay with I-70 that way, because I live right here in Commerce City and I travel I-70 quite a bit -- I mean 270 quite a bit, so I would like to see it the other way. Thank you.	Public Hearing via transcript
11	12/10/08		Unidentified Male		<p>I guess I've only got three minutes for this, and that's pretty hard to do, but what I see right here is not the representation of the community that it is going to affect, and that's going to be the poor people, minority people. And if you guys recommend this change, the one that goes further north coming through Commerce City, I'm having problems when the first time you build this you ruin whole portion of neighborhoods, and you're going to do it again. School, you're going to be ruining a school because of the noise, the traffic, and everything that comes with it, the environmental thing.</p> <p>You say justice on your sheets there, and where is the justice in that? You're going to have kids trying to learn with all of this noise going around them, and at the same time, you're going to ruin the whole school because the majority of the people may leave.</p> <p>Now, yes, business property is going to go up, but residential is going to go down. Now, the question is:</p> <p>Are you going to have mediation-type stuff, or medication, or whatever it is, and I don't think I have the right word, where you can assist and put some money into moving the school and moving some of these homes that you're going to be affecting. The dust factor, the stuff that comes off the tires, the constant noise. The way you did it the old way, the old time, you've never done anything with it. The school right there, it's amazing how you can do this to another group of people, and it's usually the poor people. Why don't you just keep it in the same area where it's already at? You've already ruined that community, and you're telling that there is no money, you know that there going to be money. And if you're going to do it to Commerce City, then do it right. Pay people or buy them a new home, buy them, and re-build a new school somewhere else for them. This is wrong, and these times of everybody wanting justice and all that, this is wrong. The conscience is wrong. You've done it before, and you're going to do it again.</p> <p>So where is the justice of environment here, just to increase traffic so that people can reach and go to have a good time or get to a plane. Thank you very much.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
12	12/10/08		Roman	Robert	My name is Robert Roman, I live in the Derby area of Commerce City. I don't see any viable benefits to our city having the northern expansion up on 270. This is just going to cause pollution and mayhem for the neighborhoods, when you have already impacted and caused pollution and mayhem in the Elmira neighborhood. Knowing the health issues that we have faced with the Rocky Mountain Arsenal and doing our part and giving as much as we have given, we do not need to be re-impacted by this effort to expand I-70 up onto 270. Thank you.	Public Hearing via transcript
13	12/10/08		Hinchliff	Diek	I can see no reasons for toll lanes. The two lanes that run N. & S. along I-25 has little traffic during rush hours while the main freeway lanes are plugged. If the two toll lanes were to be used as regular freeway lanes during rush hours, I feel that it would free up a lot of traffic during the rush hours.	Public Hearing via comment form
14	12/10/08		Smith	Trudy	I was surprised to see that dollars earned by toll options weren't reflected vs. the non-toll options in total dollars involved in the project - because toll lanes could potentially reduce pay back time of the financed project. Please reflect this on future things offered! Leave the I-70 where it is and choose the least costly alternative as to whether to expand north or south or split the difference! Don't realign to I-270 and create further congestion in our area.	Public Hearing via comment form
15	12/10/08		Thomas	Betty	I think that they should tear it down and use I-70 underneath - Rebuilt underneath now. It cost a lot of money now to repair it all the time. They could use that money to build underneath and it will be safer.	Public Hearing via comment form
16	12/10/08		Bullock	René	I feel that the choices have already been made. Ralston Purina seem to carry more importance in where their plant is than anyone else. Just the fact that they have begun construction on the plant shows that Alternative 1 and 3 will never come to past. Bad luck for Commerce City.	Public Hearing via comment form
17	12/10/08		Thomas	Danny	Remove elevated portion and put I-70 on 46th Ave. 1. No elevated portion to freeze. 2. Less coast to maintain old elevated structure	Public Hearing via comment form
18	12/10/08		Burr	Betty	Put a flyover through-fence for I-70 for people to drive direct and drive straight through (a layered highway)	Public Hearing via comment form
19	12/10/08		Mares	Joe	I am against I-70 over the bridge. The bridge is deteriorating and there is no sound barrier. There is a school nearby too. I-270 is flat land, nothing extreme, easier to pave a flat road than one on top. I-70 has Pilot station that attracts a lot of accidents. Trucks constantly coming in and out; heavy polluter. Used as main road to pull into the station. Tractor-trailers stop traffic. North or South side - only 5 or 6 (possibly) would be affected. If you stay in the area, need a sound barrier. Move it to 270, less residential, carbon monoxide would mix in and thin out. Putting it by the school, the carbon monoxide would go down to the school	Public Hearing via comment form

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
20	12/11/08	DPS	Jimenez	Arturo	<p>Okay. Is this on? My name is Arturo Jimenez, I'm the elected representative for the Denver Public Schools that encompasses Swansea, Gloville, Elyria, northwest Denver and lower west Denver and downtown. And I'm here just to make some comments as the elected representative for the area and enter into the public record that the alternative to change the course of I-70 to the north is desirable to the school district for a number of reasons. Most importantly, the quality of life, the health concerns and the educational environment for the children who attend the school. They will benefit from one of those alternative routes to the north that does not pass overhead of their homes, their school and their neighborhood. DPS knows that we can't make a decision about the school without considering the broader environment to the neighborhood around it just because the kids may benefit from moving the school further away, their homes and where they live is still below that overpass.</p> <p>And as a matter of record we've made a rough estimate of the cost because some of the alternatives ask for us to destruct and rebuild Swansea Elementary since it would be in the path of the widening of I-70. And we've estimated the costs very roughly at about \$25 million and also the costs of alternative transportation and other administrative costs associated with transferring hundreds of children to other schools. We estimate that to be about \$3 million to the district. It's also unclear that suitable land for new school construction in Swansea can be located and purchased and that total cost is unclear. Of course, the school need to deal with the demolition of I-70 or with the redoing of I-70 if that should happen and the District will be asking the state to help mitigate those environmental effects and we need --</p> <p>Thank you. And also we would be asking for the State to create safety, visual, and sound barriers between I-70 and the school property. So I just wanted to give those considerations as your elected representative for the neighborhood and thank you for your time.</p> <p>And I will give this written record to somebody here. Thank you very much. Have a good evening every one.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
21	12/11/08		Anthony	Selena	<p>Hi, my name is Selena Anthony and I'm with the Elyria neighborhood and I'm actually fairly new to the neighborhood. I've only been here about seven years. Meanwhile, my husband's third generation and several of the people that he's been working with are multi-generation as well. What we noticed is that Gloville, Elyria and Swansea have been really left out of the development of the economics of Denver where the (inaudible) that's us. And what's happened is, when you look at taking this highway and bringing it up and around, it cuts through any possibility that we have to be something different. It's silly that our neighborhood is within seven minutes, easy of downtown and our property values are about the lowest. Excuse me, so people who live way down south and have a heck of a commute have more property value than we do. And the answer is because there's nothing going on. So when they split the I-70 thing from RTD, they went in two different directions.</p> <p>RTD said, "Okay. If we put a train stop in this neighborhood, the poor people, which we primarily are, can have access to public transportation, can make a point of getting to and from things." Well, guess what, where we have picked for putting the train stop, right underneath that highway that they've got drawn. If you take the highway and (inaudible) which one is going to make our neighborhood better? Seriously, which one is going to make it better? What's happening right now is that they were going to put a nice one in, notice where the population is. They have a real easy -- to just walk over, I'm sorry, to just walk over to it. Places that have sidewalks already. It would be an amenity, it would add property value and with that --- with that being the case, we could have things like a store. Do you realize that Gloville, Elyria and Swansea together do not have a grocery store? Where else do you have to get in your car and drive a minimum ten minutes to get to a grocery -- where else in Denver? And yet that's our reality. We have the river that's right there.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					We have parks, we have all kinds of other things. We're going to be seriously negatively impacted by -- by bringing the -- that's really annoying by the way, by having the thing come up and around and through, as opposed to just let us have a train stop, keep the railroad in test B, keep the rail where it is right now.	
22	12/11/08		Pouncy	Rayford	<p>Good evening. I have been blessed to come to each of these that you're having here in this particular place. I come this evening with a positive question. One that has been floating with us for a long, long time. Is it true that RTD wants to move from down on the river and if they move their headquarters, their bus servicing areas and everything else will it still be in our area where we've got enough load already. An answer please.</p> <p>You're so kind.</p> <p>No. I heard another one, just today. Just today, I understand that there has been a boat load of money come in to assist transit units in our counties. Is that true or is it not and does it have any affect on what you're trying to do (inaudible) alignments in this same area?</p> <p>I'll be done.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
23	12/11/08		Cram	Bettie	<p>My name is Betty Cram. I've lived in this neighborhood in the Elyria, Swansea neighborhood for 57 years, same house on Josephine Street. I feel like we have been badly impacted with I-70 for one thing and I am also talking about the impact bypass would have on River Side Cemetery. It would cause a lot of environmental problems. River Side was started in 1859 and it was very historic. We need to keep the historic value of our neighborhood alive. In the old days they used it for picnics. In the present day we have children that are coming and playing here. You see wild life there. It's very historic. We have our territorial governor is buried there. General Arthur was -- started the water works and Sara Brown who is a Hall of Fame person. We have very historic -- in the future we want to preserve it for our future generation. If we have a bypass, it would take away the ambience of that. Then, also if we have a bypass, what we really need in our neighborhood is a light rail.</p> <p>The bypass would take the path of the light rail so that would ruin that. The light rail would start downtown Denver come into our area, go to Gloville, go up Thornton up onto Longmont (phonetic) and will end up in Cheyenne, Wyoming, eventually. When that comes it would be a great asset to our area. Then, also if we have a light rail --</p> <p>-- if we have a light rail it would help very much. We have, over in our -- through our neighborhood association, there has been collected over 600 signatures asking that we do not have light rail, we do not have bypass, that we do not have I-70, there are other alternatives, in fact, in last week's paper, they had an alternative in Boston --</p> <p>They had what they call the big, big. I think we can manage with that. We want -- I'm proud of my neighborhood, want us to all be proud of the neighborhood and I think we have to keep it as beautiful as we can. We're poor but proud. Thank you.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
24	12/11/08		Anthony	Coulter	It's really good park and it's fun. It's really good place. No. Nobody would go there if the highway was going through. Well, it's also a good place to rest and if they had a highway there, no place to rest.	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
25	12/11/08		Anthony	Arlund	I want to see the train stop (inaudible).	Public Hearing via transcript
26	12/11/08		Wonder	Betty	First of all, no matter what they do with this highway, I hope they can involve all the neighborhood to build it. All the construction from our neighborhood and the corridor and hire it all the employees from our neighborhood. That's number one. Number two, I think that I thought of this for five years what to do and I keep changing my mind to bring it back. And I think the best thing for it is just leave it where it's at and redo it. That's about it.	Public Hearing via transcript
27	12/11/08		Anthony	Tom	<p>I'm the president of Elyria Neighborhood Association and I have a few little helpers here, it helps that -- it's easy to say a picture is worth a thousand words and I've only got three minutes to tell five year long story here so, yes, Maxine, if you want to hold things one at a time, as you can see this is a picture of I-70 looking east. There is the mousetrap and out there is Quebec and right here is Elyria and Swansea and you could see it's kind of skinny right there. And that's the problem, it's too skinny right there. So we proposed, five years ago, they put -- they take half of it down and put that half in a tunnel, add another six lanes and a tunnel so you wind up taking about a hundred feet on the north side, which is about 14 buildings. But all the rest of the houses that are staying are backed up to a 150 foot wide park. If you put that part in a tunnel then the rest is in this elevated section. Well, we thought it was smartest from a transportation perspective it keeps it in a nice straight line.</p> <p>It minimizes the damage to the neighborhood, it gives the kids at Swansea Elementary an extra 150 feet of recess room in the back. And it makes the environment better. So we went and got 600 signatures here and then we gave them to the document control at the EIS, February 28, 2005 and we had it delivered to Councilwoman Montero, March 3, 2005. Almost four years ago. Was this tunnel alternative ever studied, no. They studied going down a hundred feet deep and said, "Oh well we can't do that." Then they studied --</p> <p>-- 12 lanes wide and four more lanes besides that. "Oh we can't do that." So then they drew the realignment which went down William Street and that was in 2005 it went on their website and that's what Ms. Montero wanted to have happen because that's what you wrote the letter supporting. In 2004, this was the foreclosure rates in Denver. 2005, --</p> <p>There's Elyria right there. 2006, there's Elyria right there. 2007, we'd started leading the way in foreclosure rates and I don't have to tell the people in the real estate industry why. So the damage is already done and you can see --</p> <p>That's my neighborhood (inaudible).</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
28	12/11/08		Fender	Gloria	I'm right here. We were supporting the I-70 Alua (phonetic) tunnel for the smoother traffic and better air. But I've also heard the children safety, the safety of the elderly and to think that I've been here for a long, long tunnel that we want to save and that would be really, really good and that's all I've got to say. Thank you.	Public Hearing via transcript
29	12/11/08		Castor	Michelle	<p>My name is Michelle and I'm from Elyria neighborhood of (inaudible) area. I guess my question is more, I mean, I see a lot of the charts back here that talk to us about what different factors are going cause and effect on our neighborhoods and I'm wondering why we're talking about mitigation and stuff like that and what we're going to do to prevent those things. But this neighborhood has a history of being really polluted and just not had a lot of luck over the years and want to put it really lightly. And so I'm curious as to why nobody's taken the time to really look at what can we do for the neighborhood as it exists now and the people in this neighborhood and what you're going to do for them if these changes happen because we're already seeing a higher existence of health problems, cancer rates are up, heart disease is up, birth defects are up. This is a really poor neighborhood like Tom was saying.</p> <p>The foreclosure rates in this area are super high and what seems like what I'm hearing from this presentation is that the concern is how can we get traffic moving better through this neighborhood but not anything about what can do for the people who actually live in this neighborhood. So I just want to know what you all are actually aside from mitigating certain things because the fact remains that this area is pretty poor off right now. So I'm not really concerned like what you might do under certain conditions. I just want to know what you're going to do now and in the future.</p> <p>(inaudible) you were talking about the environment and this and that, why you all wouldn't have those answers for us now.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
30	12/11/08		Fender	Tom	Yes, well like the lady was saying, the cancer rates are high, the -- The cancer rates are high, the lung damage is high, all the pollution that comes off that highway causes more damage to the neighborhood. That's why I support an underground tunnel going through the neighborhood. They said it would remove a lot of the pollution that's going through the neighborhood or coming off that highway to the children and old folks, especially. That's all I've got to say.	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
31	12/11/08		Nicholas	Jeremy	<p>Good evening. My name is Jeremy Nicholas and I live in Curtis Park. I have to say I'm incredibly blown away at how this Environmental Impact Statement just does not get that some of the major air quality problems here in the Denver metro area. One particular probably is ozone air pollution, the key ingredient to smog. Right now, we're in violation of ozone air pollution standards. Not only that but the standards were strengthened this year. I don't see how the proposal on the table right now does anything to address that problem. Also extremely concerned about diesel particulate matter and what that does to our children. You can move the freeway wherever you want but it doesn't get to the root cause of some of the serious health problems in this region. I'd go with what Tom Anthony said. I'm deeply concerned that the tunnel alternative was not considered in detail in this Environmental Impact Statement. I think that raises serious concerns that a range of reasonable alternatives were not considered and I think it makes this whole proposal extremely vulnerable to future legal challenges.</p> <p>And I think that unless a proposal comes together that fully explores reasonable alternatives, alternatives that get to the root of the problems we're facing here in the Denver metro area, we're going to be at this a long time. I think it behooves us all to come together and find out a solution to all these problems. Thank you.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
32	12/11/08		Zapien	John	<p>Thank you. My name is John Zapien. I live over in Gloville. You should have put some chocolate syrup on this damn thing. Okay. First of all, I personally want to thank you and the effort that's been forthcoming from -- over the last five years. But I think we're at a crossroads now. And all respect, you know, I want to thank you for what you have done. But I think now, self interest has come into short focus and don't want anybody to take anything personally. But the EIS, I don't think is worth the paper it's written on. Truthfully, I haven't gone through the whole thing and I respectfully request that the comment period time, what is it, the 31st of January, be extended six months. We need more time to go through good details and respectfully request some technical resources or interpretations of things we don't frankly understand. This is a blue collar neighborhood, working neighborhood and people don't have the resources, access all of the technical terms and we need some interpretations. We need technical help in doing that and I think since you're spending our money, you have a -- more obligation to do so.</p> <p>And so far as the study itself, I think it's a bad, and I don't want to be racial about this but it reminds me of Eastern European politics. They take a slice to the (inaudible) and before you know it, the whole stick of salami's gone. It's a bad reflection on our state planning, on our highway department. City of Denver's (inaudible) for years and apparently the State --</p> <p>-- State caught on and they're doing the same thing. I think we need to have a full comprehensive study of I-70 itself from the Kansas border to the Utah border and how it affects every community in between business wise, health wise, the transportation issue itself. It affects all of us. We're going to be hearing --</p> <p>You know you better call the cops because I ain't gonna quit talking.</p> <p>The whole thing is that we're going to get bombarded with trying to pull our shambled economy out and I don't want us to become a scapegoat by saying we need to build more roads and we've got to build this highway, run over our asses to save the economy. No, we don't need that.</p> <p>Call the cops.</p> <p>In so far as other things, you need to address the air, quality, the impacts on health, social, cultural and economic opportunities for the people that live here. We don't need another highway in this neighborhood. Sixty years ago the people said the same thing. Thank you.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
33	12/11/08		McPeck	Frederick	<p>I'm Frederick McPeck, a founding board member and past president, (inaudible) Gloville Visitor Association and a then on the corner of 47th, right in the middle of the boulevard and the post office building for just under 40 years. In, I think, the 1980s, Betty Crem and Betty Wonder and Roberta will remember, they're the only ones I can remember attending those meetings. We attended some 20 meetings and the environmental assessment for the inner state extension from I-25 to (inaudible) and the ten years later or whatever it was when they built that (inaudible), as John said, I don't agree with what is being done or that it will be done relative to what's going to be reported. After the, that part of the highway was completed, this EIS started and you mentioned Sharon Lipp was in charge of -- left that project, was in charge of the new project and then the previous project wasn't finished. And they didn't adhere to the EA. Then it was not Environmental Impact Statement and I realize that an environmental assessment is a shorter process but they did not adhere to that process.</p> <p>So how do we know we're going to adhere to this process? The one most important thing is, and who can tell me here, is there a CDOT representative that can tell me where the drainage from any --</p> <p>-- any highway, any (inaudible) that they use, where the drainage is going to go.</p> <p>That's frustrating.</p> <p>There's a couple of other things. When the EIS and the RTD were together, there was \$21 million that were appropriated, I think it was \$7 million from the City, \$7 million from the county, \$7 million from the --</p> <p>-- from highway that was appropriated and they separated but where did that money go? No one has ever mentioned it. We're spending \$20 million now gluing this -- that elevated back together again and if we're going to build a new highway, isn't that wasted? So I've got a lot more but that's a start.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
34	12/11/08		Waggoner	Roberta	<p>I was born and raised in this neighborhood at 46th and Josephine. I was born in the house, I lived there until we got married and then we bought a house in Farmer City. Then we moved back in 1978 to be with my mother. This, I know he keeps talking about a tunnel. What's he going to do if that tunnel would fill up with water like it does underneath the railroad track (inaudible). Where would we be at? Another thing, it would be too costly to keep the monoxide out of it. We don't need it. And he just keeps pumping and pumping and pumping. That was tabled a long time ago. Why don't he listen. That's all I got to say. We don't need it and all you can do is fix up that viaduct, put it in there and forget about this other bull crap. And that's the way I feel. Thank you.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
35	12/11/08		McPeck	Frederick	<p>(inaudible)80216 is the highest polluted area in Colorado and the 80216 has the fastest dropping property values. 80216 -- 80216 is the highest polluted area in the state. Area code. Area code, right. And 80216 is the area where the property values are dropping faster than any other area in the city.</p>	Public Hearing via transcript
36	12/11/08		Zapien	John	<p>You're not going to call the cops are you?</p> <p>I certainly will. Thank you for the opportunity. One of the things I think is most important for the state to understand, 60 years ago the lines were drawn and we didn't have this process then. And that's what makes this so important that it be a true process, not just a walk-thru, dog and pony show. And that's where the technical resources are important. We need those things to interpret these things. We need -- nobody's talking about how many tons of air pollution is being pumped. The other day on US Today, they came out with a study that it does affect children and older people. And all I got to do -- we know how many people have died already. How many people got sick in these neighborhoods because of (inaudible). And it's not because of the smoking and alcohol, hell, they do that at the country club. More than we do down here because we can't afford it like they can. The problem is that the State Department of Transportation, used to be Highway Department, they have developed, through their just asinine efforts, they've created almost</p>	Public Hearing via transcript

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					a Taliban type attitude for people in the neighborhood because they don't do anything at all to help When there's a big storm in the summer time, I-70's flooded and the answer's simple. Pick up the debris on the highway. I mean down the road, there's the county jail, people are sitting there. They can get them out there and clean that up. Someone arranged it. The water would go through the drainage system as inadequate as it might be, Fred, but it would work now. That's why we need these technical -- if this is going to be a true environmental statement, then it's got to weigh, it's got to weigh the environment of this neighborhood. I mean, you don't need to be a rocket scientist to know that you don't pump more crap down the drain when it's already inundated with pollution here. All you've got to do is get in your car tonight when you go home and roll the window down, take a breath. I bet you shut it up fast, especially when you go by Purina. But, anyway, we need these things to interpret because we're going to take this to task, we've got to take it to task.	
37	12/11/08		Trejo	Cecil	Cecil Trejo, 4727 Windham, Elyria. I'd like to know how many people here live in that area. I would like to know how many people here live in that area. (inaudible). How many people are getting paid to be here? Yes. Yes. You'll be surprised. Well you know what (inaudible) -- We have a black person that's President now. (inaudible).	Public Hearing via transcript
38	12/11/08		Tate	Penfield	Good evening, my name is Penfield Tate, I live in the Park Hill neighborhood. In reviewing the various alternatives before I speak to a specific alignment, I would just like to offer this: One of the things that has me greatly concerned is our history of conducting public infrastructure projects, bringing them through neighborhoods that are impacted, but not providing an immediate impact to those neighborhoods in the form of employment for the people who live in the neighborhood. So in other words, they ought to be able to do some work on the project, and contracting opportunities for business owners who live in the impacted neighborhood. So I think that needs to be a significant and a high priority for any alignment undertaken with regard to the I-70 east corridor. Hiring residents in the impacted communities and neighborhoods, and hiring the businesses and providing opportunities for contracting, either supplies or materials, or professional services, for the businesses in those neighborhoods, or the business owners who live in that neighborhood. With regard to the alignments, my preference would be for alignment either number four or six. If four is selected, which I would support, there needs to be significant outreach to the impacted neighborhood, because I understand it will take out about a block of residential area. I would prefer four to six, even though six, I'm sure some would say that just impacts the National Western. The heritage, the tradition, and quite frankly, the employment opportunities the National Western presents for the neighborhood, I think are significant. I don't think they are greater than the value of the homes owned by the homeowners there, but if there is a way to generously compensate the homeowners so that they can afford to either acquire other homes in the same community, or build in the same community, that would be my personal preference. So, to maintain as much of the neighborhood as possible and to still keep the employment operation and the commercial operation represented by the National Western, I think that's an important goal also. Oh, the other thing I would add is with either alternative four or six, I do not -- I do not -- support any tolling lanes on any part of I-70. No tolling. Thank you.	Public Hearing via transcript
39	12/11/08		Clark	Georgia	Regarding the realignment alternative, I would like the alignment to be moved south of the Purina plant	Public Hearing via comment form
40	12/11/08		Anthony	Tom	This is what we want. I'll email a PDF (see attachment)	Public Hearing via comment form
					To Whom It May Concern: As the elected representative for the Board of Education for the Denver Public Schools in which the affected school Swansea Elementary is located, I wish to enter into the public record that the alternative to change the course of I-70 to the north is desirable for a number of reasons. Most importantly, the quality of life, the health concerns and the educational environment for the children who attend the school will benefit from an alternate route that does not pass overhead of their homes, school, and neighborhood. Also, the other alternatives that suggest widening the highway and rebuilding the school in a different location will result in an undesirable and detrimental effect on the children who will have to be sent to different schools far outside the neighborhood.	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
41	12/11/08	DPS	Jimenez	Arturo	<p>In addition, we recognize that the environmental justice issues will remain for the families in the neighborhood even if the school is moved to a different location.</p> <p>As a matter of record and planning, the district has made a rough estimate of the costs should the route of I-70 remain intact and the state wishes to destruct and rebuild a new school for Swansea neighborhood children. The cost of rebuilding a school is estimated at \$25million. The cost of alternative transportation and other administrative costs associated with transferred hundereds of children to other schools is estimated at \$3 million dollars to the district.</p> <p>It is unclear that suitable land for new school construction in Swansea can be located and purchased. The total cost is unclear.</p> <p>As the district representative, I urge the decision makers to strongly consider the alternative that changes thre route of I-70 to the north and leave Swansea Elementary intact. Of course, the shcool will need funds to deal with the demolition of I-70 even if the route is changed.</p> <p>That amount is unclear and I am committed to working with the State to resolve those issues with our school district.</p> <p>Sincerely, Arturo Jimenez</p> <p>Director District 5 Denver Public Schools Board of Education arturo_jimenez@dpsk12.org</p>	Public Hearing via letter
42	12/11/08		Schaub	Joseph	<p>I have been coming to these meetings for 6 years. I have seen all the maps, head about all the different ways the project would or could go and in reality it's getting kind of crazy. I would like to hear about somebody putting a shovel into the ground and getting this project started. No more B.S.</p> <p>P.S. I prefer #6 or #4</p>	Public Hearing via comment form
43	12/12/08		Frankland	Chris	<p>I would to see I-70 below grade similar to I-25 in the narrows area between Broadway and University. The preservation and re-strengthening of the impacted neighborhoods is paramount, and I believe a below grade (not a tunnel) solution does this best. Me question would be what are the cost estimates for each alternative below grade? Is this even a possibility? Pedestrian and bike trail access is also a very important consideration.</p>	Public Hearing via comment form
Stakeholder Comments						
44	11/20/08		Mays	Doris	<p>Concerned about neighborhood impact on the Gloveville and Swansea areas if Alternatives 4 or 6 are adopted. Also the overall cost of the project is a concern, especially since this study is taking so long. There is a need for "emergency" lanes and room for future expansion.</p> <p>All merge lanes entering I-70 between Colorado Blvd. and Brighton Blvd. need to be longer, and the w/b I-70 merge onto s/b I-25 where there is ALWAYS a back-up needs to be re-configured.</p> <p>Does the w/b I-70 exit at Dahlia have to be so close to the w/b ramp entering I-70 from Quebec Street?</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
45	11/30/08		Crouse	Phillip	<p>We live in the Stapleton area and have 2 concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise abatement - Central Park I-70 intersection <p>Aesthetics - Litter clean up and architecture improvement Reduce tire noise. Traffic noise from I-70 can be heard 5 miles away Include the Central Park Ave Intersection How will light rail interact with the project</p> <p>The Noise Impact of the EIS did not include evaluating different pavements to reduce tire noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The noise reduction criteria is not strigent enough. You don't need to be living next to the highway to be impacted by the traffic noise. We are 2 miles away from the highway and are impacted by the traffic noise. - Earthen berms along the highway corridor should be considered for noise abatement. This also will improve the looks of the highway when trees are planted and are inexpensive. - Is the projected increase in traffic volume warranted given the supply of fuel in the future <p>Thank You!</p>	website
46	12/8/08		Anthony	Tom	Document request	e-mail to Michelle Halstead
47	12/24/08		Anthony	Sister Antonia	I am concerned about the well-being and integrity of the Elyria neighborhood and an ecologically good choice for the rest of us. I'm asking for your agreement with the Elyria neighborhood for an eight-block tunnel that leaves four lanes elevated for local connections. Thank you.	website
48	12/24/08	Wild Earth Guardians	Nichols	Jeremy	Comment period extension request to April 1, 2009	letter to Russ George and Karla Petty
49	12/24/08		Anthony	Pete	<p>I live in coastal NC but I grew up in Denver. I've seen and driven in cities globally. Mexico City was the worst, but Cairo and Delhi come a close 2nd and 3rd.</p> <p>I know you're stuck with the I-70/ I-25 interchange... can't change that. But your mousetrap is maybe the worst conjunction of roads I've ever seen in my life! Way worse than the A3 and A5 Autobahn junction in Frankfurt, Germany (which is a nightmare... trust me!)</p>	website
50	12/26/08	University of Denver	Harris	Michael	Document request	e-mail to Russell George
51	12/26/08		Chuck	Erwin	<p>As a semi-frequent user, I am opposed to any plan that reroutes I-70 into I-270. This will only add to costs, and create additional conflict points on I-270 leading to increased congestion. It only benefits a few homeowners in the area. The VAST majority of them moved into the neighborhood AFTER I-70 was built. Why waste taxpayer dollars rerouting an interstate to appease residents who purchased their home after the freeway was built. They knew the freeway is there, and yet bought there home anyway. Sounds like "they want their cake and eat it too." Well, not at taxpayer expense. What we need is additional general purpose lanes along the current path of I-70. We spent millions reconstructing part of the old viaduct. Why waste part of that by rerouting the freeway? Plus, the proposed curves are sharp, creating congestion as traffic slows.</p>	website
52	12/31/08		Brethauer	Steve	<p>Thank you for the chance to give my thoughts.</p> <p>I am aware of the added expense in building the I-70 loop. I feel that doing the loop will allow less disruption in the flow of traffic on the major East/West Corridor while the building process is going on. I would also think that loosing the tax revenue from the multitude of business that would be affected along the north side of the Highway, not just the ones forced to shut down or relocate) but during the time of lost revenue during the construction. There also is a possibility of less man hour time lost due to traffic jams, causing some lost revenue.</p>	website
53	1/24/09		Gonzalez	Alejandro	I am strongly in favor of using one of the tolled alternatives.	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
54	1/31/09		Fisher	Stephen	<p>I am concerned that a potentially viable option for the viaduct portion of I-70 is not being considered: below-grade highway. The benefits are clear: use existing right-of-way; reduce noise and visual impacts to Swansea, Globeville, and Elyria neighborhoods (as well as motorists); no realignment issues; no high-maintenance bridges; easier to manage snow and ice; enable reconnection of neighborhood and community across top of interstate using bridges and pedestrian malls.</p> <p>For example, the Seattle Alaskan Way viaduct project considers a below-grade lidded or un-lidded open trench as an option. Also, see these examples from the Houston area: http://www.i45parkway.com/i45-images4/i45atNorthMain.jpg http://www.i45parkway.com/i45-images4/AirPollution-5.jpg</p>	website
55	2/9/09		Damron	Dave	<p>I travel a lot throughout the Denver metro area and am interested in project enhancements being evaluated. By using modern multi-modal transportation planning tools with state-of-the-art construction techniques. Look at longterm (50+ years) solutions rather than bandaid approaches.</p>	website
56	3/3/2009		Nixon	Carl	<p>As a resident that will be directly affected by this project - I have studied all 700+ pages of the DEIS and have come to the conclusion that options number 4 or 6 are the best for our neighborhood. Those of us that live on the North side of I-70 live a certain, if not at times dislocated, life from the rest of Denver. Ask any citizen of Denver if that is Denver over there and they will say - "no - thats commerce city". For my property values, peace of mind, and the ability to be a part of Denver once again - I have to vote for option 4/6. Regards, Carl Nixon</p>	website
57	3/3/2009		Nixon	Carl	<p>As a resident living a block from the current I-70 viaduct - I wanted to write in and make sure my voice is heard. Those of us that live north of I-70 and west of Vasquez Blvd find ourselves in a precarious position. We are cut off from the rest of Denver with only a few streets coming into the neighborhood. Options 1/3 and the no-change option will all further cut our neighborhood in two. The movement of I-70 to the North [options 4/6] would make our quality of life 100 times better... It would also open up the neighborhood streets that will otherwise be blocked - making our neighborhood accessible from only two streets - 48th or York. To make matters worse - the freeway exchange at York is planning on being removed making it more difficult to get onto the freeway - further isolating our neighborhood. Not to mention the property value issues - if 46th were to be turned into a boulevard - we would see an increase in the property values along that corridor - which would translate into higher tax revenues. This would also open the area up for new development of the acres and acres of warehouses that are half occupied within the area. Anyone that drive 270 knows how horrible that stretch of roadway is - as is the current viaduct - so it makes sense to combine the two projects into one cost - and make north denver a more beautiful place to live. Please vote option 4/6. ~Carl</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
58	3/4/09		Lewis, II	Walter J.	I recommend options 3 or 6 since the toll lanes, although higher costs than the general purpose lanes will provide greater flexibility to the State and travelling public and provide a revenue source for future improvements to the corridor(s).	website
59	3/6/09		Zeppelin	Mickey	<p>I-70 East EIS Colorado Department of Transportation 4670 N. Holly Street Denver, CO 80216</p> <p>To the I-70 East EIS: I am principal in the TAXI Development and am the owner of more than 20 acres of land at 3457 Ringsby Court and have been active in developing the River North Plan and other activities in the River North Globeville area. I have analysed the East I-70 Alternatives and feel strongly that Alternative 3, expanding the existing I-70 roadway is the best plan.</p> <p>The proposed new alignment (Alternative 4) to the north is some \$230 million dollars more costly and its impact on the neighborhood will be significantly negative. That alternative to put a new freeway alignment over the neighborhood in an area that is ripe for redevelopment in all probability will preclude responsible planning and growth for the next 10-20 years.</p> <p>It will have a major negative impact on property owners below and alongside the new alignment.</p> <p>Property owners along the existing I-70 will be impacted by the additional lanes. However, new and improved technology should mitigate some noise, air pollution and drainage impacts. The Elyria Swansea neighborhood would be significantly impacted by the Alternative 3 alignment.</p> <p>Actual construction in all probability would not commence for at least ten years. The proposed new alignment would put a dark cloud over any proposed land uses during that period. The existing I-70 alignment is in place and would have a minimum impact by the lane expansion for the new lanes. Moreover, the land uses along the existing alignment are in place and have already accommodated to the current I-70 alignment.</p> <p>We strongly oppose Alternative 4 and urge you to adopt Alternative 3.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Mickey Zeppelin</p>	letter submitted via website
60	3/7/09		Changaris	Mark	<p>I represent Commerce City in connection with its review of the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (the "DEIS"). I am interested in portions of the DEIS that discuss the designation and determination of the 'no-action' alternative. Specifically, I am looking for any analysis that may be within the DEIS that pertains to the determination that the existing viaduct between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard must be replaced. Is there any analysis within the DEIS that discusses and analyzes: (a) the age and quality of the existing viaduct; (b) the structural integrity of the existing viaduct; or (c) the nature and sufficiency of current maintenance and repair programs for the existing viaduct? Please also direct me to the portions of the DEIS that discuss why the continued maintenance and repair of the viaduct is not a feasible no-action alternative.</p> <p>Finally, are there any sections of the DEIS that discuss or analyze the impacts of maintaining the viaduct in its current state without reconstruction? If you have any questions regarding any of the above requests for information, please feel free to contact me by phone or e-mail.</p>	e-mail to Tony Stewart

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
61	3/8/09		Erwin	Chuck	I am concerned that neighborhood issues are trumping commuter interests. I am totally opposed to diverting I-70 through the industrial armpit of the region just to appease a few homeowners. The vast majority of which chose to live there will after the highway was built. Rerouting I-70 will congestion as it will increase the number of conflict points. It will also increase pollution in the Metro Area as the distance required to travel from the east to the west sides rises. Kinks in roads are never shorter than strait shots. Thus, the increased length of I-70 as it meanders to I-270, and then back to the current highway will increase miles driven, and pollution. As the Metro Area's pollution teaters on the edge of EPA standards, this is an increase we can ill-afford.	e-mail to Mark Boggs; e-mail to Tony Stewart; website
62	3/8/09		Erwin	Chuck	<p>I am hugely concerned about the proposal to divert I-70 to I-270 (alternatives 4, and 6). The diversion will have a huge NEGATIVE impact on the region's economy, and image. Here's why: I-70 is a heavily traveled highway by tourists who use it as a gateway to the Rockies. Do we really want to divert this gateway through the industrial armpit of Denver, better known as Commerce City, and it's legion of rusty OLD refineries? What type of impression does that make? Currently, more locals than tourists use I-270 as it crosses this blighted area. I-70 traffic only sees it from a distance. This will all change if I-70 is diverted to appease a few homeowners (the vast majority of which bought their homes well after the construction of I-70). If the highway is diverted, all east/west through traffic will go my this eyesore. Even though it makes up only a small fraction of metro area land use, it will have a profound negative impact on peoples' impression of Denver. Denver will be perceived by many as much dirtier than if this dirty little secret remains on a highway used primarily by locals.</p> <p>This impression will harm economic recovery. Remember, some of these tourists using I-70 are business leaders who one day might want to relocate their business here (including those who flew into DIA to check out our city. How will they get to downtown, and the cultural hub of the Mile High City from DIA? I-70. What impression will they get if the gateway to the Rockies is diverted through Commerce City's rusty refineries belching out a toxic blend of fumes? Denver is a beautiful place. Lets not dirty its image by diverting I-70 traffic through the heart of the metro area's rusty industrial core just to appease a few homeowners. Protect Denver's economic vitality, and it's pristine image. Keep I-70 on its current path (prefer additional general purpose lanes). Do not divert it to I-270.</p>	e-mail to Mark Boggs; e-mail to Tony Stewart; website
					<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Univar USA to provide comments and voice concerns pertaining to the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).</p> <p>First, some background on Univar USA. This year, we celebrate our 85th anniversary as a responsible and ethical distributor of chemical products and related services. We operate 100 distribution facilities throughout the United States and employ more than 4300 people. We are the leader in our industry.</p> <p>Furthermore, this year marks the 50th anniversary of our Denver branch, a local office and distribution facility that employs 46 people and serves customers throughout Colorado and in parts of Wyoming and Nebraska. In 2008, Univar's Denver facility sold approximately \$51 million worth of products and provided over \$48,000 in annual sales tax contributions to the local tax base. Additionally, Univar made significant investment upgrades of \$3.5 million dollars to our Denver facility in 2008.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
63	3/9/09	Univar	Weber-Millstein	Karen	<p>According to page 23 of Appendix D of the I-70 East DEIS (version 2), the I-70 East project would impact the Denver branch of Univar USA as follows:</p> <p>Alternatives 1 and 3 South-Adverse Effects Alternatives 1 and 3 South would result in the ROW acquisition of the entire 5.00 acres of this property, which would be an adverse effect to the historic property.</p> <p>In addition to the permanent loss of a historic property (according to CDOT), the closure and relocation of the Univar USA branch at 4300 Holly Street would cause a significant near-term (and possible long-term) financial impact to our Denver and regional business operations. Expected negative financial consequences of Alternatives 1 and 3 to Univar USA include the loss of sales revenue, the incurrence of additional and unplanned expenses, and the possibility of disrupted and/or lost jobs. In addition, the hundreds of customers and suppliers that depend on our Denver branch could experience a significant adverse impact to their businesses.</p> <p>For the above reasons, Univar USA respectfully requests that CDOT eliminate Alternatives 1 and 3 from consideration for the I-70 East project. If you have any questions concerning Univar USA comments, please feel free to contact me at 425-638-4911.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Karen Weber-Millstein Manager - Corporate Communications Univar</p>	letter submitted via website and via Jim Bemelen
64	3/9/09		Picher	Lewis	First choice is Alternative 6; Second choice is Alternative 4	e-mail to Tony Stewart
65	3/12/09		Zeppelin	Mickey	<p>I-70 East EIS Colorado Department of Transportation 4670 N. Holly Street Denver, CO 80216</p> <p>To the I-70 East EIS: I am principal in the TAXI Development and am the owner of more than 20 acres of land at 3457 Ringsby Court and have been active in developing the River North Plan and other activities in the River North Globeville area. I have analysed the East I-70 Alternatives and feel strongly that Alternative 3, expanding the existing I-70 roadway is the best plan.</p> <p>The proposed new alignment (Alternative 4) to the north is some \$230 million dollars more costly and its impact on the neighborhood will be significantly negative. That alternative to put a new freeway alignment over the neighborhood in an area that is ripe for redevelopment in all probability will preclude responsible planning and growth for the next 10-20 years.</p> <p>It will have a major negative impact on property owners below and alongside the new alignment. Property owners along the existing I-70 will be impacted by the additional lanes. However, new and improved technology should mitigate some noise, air pollution and drainage impacts. The Elyria Swansea neighborhood would be significantly impacted by the Alternative 3 alignment.</p> <p>However, the impacts may be mitigated by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dealing fairly and expeditiously with the many home and business owners whose property will be taken. 2. Replace the existing school with a state of the art new school, centrally located in the area. 3. In reconstructing, design the new highway to maximize connections to streets that are disconnected from the neighborhood like Clayton and Columbine. 	letter submitted via website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>4. Utilize the under portion of the highway in a creative way, allowing for parks or other uses.</p> <p>5. Provide proper buffers and park areas between highway and adjacent homes to maintain community environment.</p> <p>Actual construction in all probability would not commence for at least ten years. The proposed new alignment would put a dark cloud over any proposed land uses during that period. The existing I-70 alignment is in place and would have a minimum impact by the lane expansion for the new lanes. Moreover, the land uses along the existing alignment are in place and have already accommodated to the current I-70 alignment.</p> <p>We strongly oppose Alternative 4 and urge you to adopt Alternative 3.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Mickey Zeppelin</p>	
66	3/14/09		Burgess	Larry	<p>I-70 East EIS Colorado Department of Transportation 4670 N. Holly Street Denver, CO 80216</p> <p>To the I-70 East EIS: I am a business and property owner In the River North Area and I have been very active in developing the River North Plan as well as participating for years in the I-70 EIS process, Fastracks, and other development projects. I have analyzed the East I-70 alternatives and feel very strongly that of all the alternatives presented In the EIS that Alternative 3, expanding the existing I-70 roadway, is by far the best plan.</p> <p>The proposed new alignment (Alternative 4) to the north is some \$230 million dollars more costly and its impact on the neighborhood will be significantly more negative. The alternative to put a new freeway alignment over the neighborhood in an area that is ripe for redevelopment in all probability will preclude responsible planning and growth for the next 10-20 years. It will have a major negative Impact on property owners below and alongside the new alignment.</p> <p>Property owners along the existing I-70 will be impacted by the additional lanes. However, new and improved technology should mitigate some noise, air pollution and drainage impacts. The Elyria Swansea neighborhood would be significantly impacted by the Alternative 3 alignment.</p> <p>However, by doing the right thing the Impacts may be mitigated by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacing the existing school with a state of the art new school, larger play ground, and make it centrally located in the area. 2. In reconstructing I-70, design the new highway to maximize connections to streets that are disconnected from the neighborhood like Clayton and Columbine streets. 3. Design the highway so that it connects the Elyria Swansea area with the rest of the city to the South not as it is presently constructed, where it is a site barrier and has been allowed to become an visual eye sore. 4. Dealing fairly and expeditiously with the many home and business owners whose property will be taken, so that they can get on with their lives. 5. Provide proper buffers and park areas between the highway and adjacent homes to maintain community environment. 	letter sent twice to Tony Stewart

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>6. Utilize the under portion of the highway in a creative way, allowing for parks and other community uses that will provide for a better live style.</p> <p>Since actual construction will probably not commence for at least another ten years, the proposed new alignment would put a dark cloud over any proposed land uses during that period. The existing I-70 alignment is in place and would have a minimum impact by the lane expansion for the new lanes. Also, the land uses along the existing alignment are in place and have already accommodated to the current I-70 alignment.</p> <p>I strongly oppose Alternative 4 and urge you to adopt Alternative 3.</p> <p>Sincerely Larry L. Burgess, Mgr Platte Partners, LLC Mr. Larry L. Burgess, Mgr #3 Red Fox Lane Littleton, CO 80127-5710</p>	
67	3/16/09		Hirst	Kimberly	<p>It is my understanding that there are changes that would necessitate Coca-Cola trucks to drive through our neighborhood.</p> <p>This is totally unacceptable. We have a residential neighborhood with MANY children playing and walking to school. The noise is also worrisome.</p>	website
68	3/16/09		Weatherill	Ashleigh	<p>During construction, it would be preferable if the construction management team and Cola-Cola could find a way to shut down the I-70 ramp for limited periods of time in order to limit the number of (Coca-Cola)trucks to traversing the neighborhood streets.</p>	website
					<p>CDOT I-70 East EIS Study Team Attn: Tony Stewart 4670 N. Holly St. Denver, CO 80216</p> <p>Dear Mr. Stewart:</p> <p>This letter is to record with the CDOT I-70 East EIS Study Team (CDOT) the view of The Western Stock Show Association, herein noted as the NWSS, in regard to the several repair/enhancement options on the table as outlined in the DEIS.</p> <p>The NWSS commends the study for clearly recognizing the necessity of an action plan for major investment in replacing/enhancing the section of I-70 extending from Brighton Blvd to Tower Road. The present facility is well beyond its design life, has insufficient vehicle capacity for the public need and is unsafe for the driving public. The NWSS has been in its location adjacent to I-70 since the interstate was constructed in its present location. Further, the NWSS has been a neighbor to all the work done on I-70 in this locale, as well as all the work on the I-25/I-70 interchange in the last couple decades. Generally, the improvements have been an asset.</p> <p>The CDOT options now under discussion range from ones with modest impact to the NWSS to ones that could put the NWSS out of business in its present location. All the options referenced in Exhibit -3 entitled "DEIS Alternatives" will be commented on herein.</p> <p>1. No-Action Alternative</p> <p>The NWSS agrees with the CDOT position summarized on page S-5 of the DEIS Executive Summary.</p> <p>2. Alternatives 1 Existing and 3 existing, Tolloed These alternatives would seem to meet many of the CDOT stated objectives of improved mobility and safety. These options may have significant local community impacts. However, as it relates to NWSS, there do NOT seem to be significant negative consequences.</p> <p>3. Alternatives 4 Realigned and 6 Realigned, Tolloed The element of tolled or not tolled embraced in these alternatives is a public policy issue of major importance to COOT and other interests as well as the traveling public. However, the NWSS would prefer the highway system that serves its present site NOT be a toll facility. Tolls add inconvenience and cost to our clients, many of whom visit our shows intermittently.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
69	3/18/09	National Western	Grant	Patrick	<p>Changing this element could cause confusion when trying to access the NW S facilities. Further, a number of our clients, many with large vehicles conveying animals, are from outside the Denver Metro area and will be among those initially confused and unhappy about tolls.</p> <p>The NWSS focuses it major concerns on what are described as Alternatives 4 & 6 West and Alternatives 4 & 6 East.</p> <p>4. Alternatives 4 & 6 West Alternatives 4 & 6 West call for CDOT actions that clearly put the NWSS out of business in this present location. Several of the NWSS historical and major exhibition buildings would be destroyed or rendered unusable for the National Western Stock Show and most of the 100 plus other shows that use the present facilities. But, the NWSS, as it contemplates its second century of facility and program goal and associated need, is discussing whether to move or stay at its present location. Hence, the timing of CDOT decisions and actions are essential to the NWSS decision process, as well as the significant economic consequences of CDOT actions that impact the NWSS.</p> <p>5. Alternatives 4 & 6 East Alternatives 4 & 6 East also are of great concern to the NWSS. These alternatives appear to leave the NWSS structures intact, but have major impact on the traffic flow patterns that serve the NWSS. It is far from clear how the many design and operational issue could be worked out. The impact may be such as to effectively determine whether the NWSS must move or could stay at its present location. Again, timing of CDOT's decision and planned actions are important to the future of the NWSS.</p> <p>Linked to whatever decision CDOT makes, the NWSS must consider in its own business model what location and future facility needs will best serve the vision, mission and values of The Western Stock Show Association. This brings into play the many decades of contractual relationship between NWSS and the City and County of Denver (CCD), as well as recognition that the CCD core real estate development is moving toward the NWSS site.</p> <p>NWSS must also contemplate the planning activities of the RTD, the BNSF, and CCD's plan for enhancing the South Platte River within the area currently utilized by the NWSS.</p> <p>In conclusion, the CDOT DEIS and its Record of Decision are extremely important to the NWSS, programmatically, financially, economically and politically. We will continue to be available for further discussions with agents of CDOT at any time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patrick A. Grant President & CEO</p>	letter sent to Tony Stewart
70	3/23/09		Fisher	Elia	<p>Dear I-70 East Project Team,</p> <p>My name is Elia Fisher. I am a life-long resident of Denver who has lived the majority of my life in the Globeville Neighborhood. I am writing to submit my comment about the I-70 East Environmental Impact Survey.</p> <p>I feel that the No-Action Alternative is the best decision for the citizens of Denver, the surrounding suburbs, and the greater Front Range.</p> <p>I believe that the lane count expansion of Interstate 70 from Washington Street east to Quebec Street, which is proposed in each of the other alternatives, will only increase regional air pollution, traffic congestion, and the overall number of automobile accidents within the corridor. I also feel that a larger structural footprint would negatively impact the quality of life of the neighboring residents.</p> <p>Please consider my words of support for the No-Action Alternative when advancing to the next stage of the decision making process.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	e-mail submitted through Contact Us

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
71	3/23/09		Gable	Juanita	<p>I am concerned that the city has not given adequate (or any) consideration to a plan by the Elyria Neighborhood Association to submerge Interstate 70 underground and to create shopping and light rail development areas on the plateau. This plan would be a dramatic improvement to the environment and culture of a depressed area that desperately needs attention. I am concerned that there seems to be little to no attention paid to the intersection of I70 with I25 - a single lane that generates such an intense bottle neck as to produce many of the accidents and traffic jams on I-70 within the area that is of concern to the city and CDOT. You could widen the highway as much as you want, but without widening the access point onto I25, you'll only increase the same issues in the future. I am concerned that the environmental impact statement includes NOTHING regarding the environmental impact to the area residents who would be adversely affected by all of the proposed measures.</p> <p>Mostly what I find concerning is that CDOT has given no acknowledgement of the alternative plan to submerge I70 despite the presentation of this idea by our neighborhood association and hundreds of signatures on previously submitted petitions. I have always believed that the government is one by the people for the people, but despite the appearance of welcoming public comments, CDOT has given no consideration to the plan brought forth from the community that these plans affect most. Apparently we do not live in a democracy. How disappointing.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
72	3/24/09	Globeville Civic Assoc.	Hirsch	Paulette	<p>James Bemelen Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>On March 18th, 2009, the Board of The Globeville Civic Association #1, a registered neighborhood group in Denver, met to discuss the impacts of the alternatives presented by CDOT for construction of I & J for the East Corridor.</p> <p>It was the unanimous conclusion (with 8 out of 9 persons present) that both of the alternatives include impacts which are too serious in their environmental impacts to be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Widening the highway will result in impacting as well as removing many residences. The Swansea School will be subjected to intolerable pollution.</p> <p>Running the Highway to the North will result in dislocated undesirable businesses being relocated in this neighborhood which is the site of much of the remaining industrial zone lots in Denver. Pollution within the Neighborhood will be increased rather than diminished.</p> <p>It was the unanimous conclusion of our Board that CDOT should look at ways to run traffic on a beltway outside of neighborhoods in order that impacts to our residents would be less. We recognize that the cost involved in implementing this solution could be substantial but so is the human cost of once more negatively impacting the lives and health of the residents of these historic neighborhoods.</p> <p>Paulette Hirsch President-Globeville Civic Association I</p>	letter submitted via website
					<p>I-70 East DEIS Public Comment C/O Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen: The U.S. economy is in a deep recession, a fourth of the homes in metro Denver, are underwater, and the Colorado Legislature is debating into the night, trying to cover <u>part</u> of CDOT's delayed highway/bridge maintenance costs. This, even with the Federal bail-out, will not provide enough money, by a factor of ten to bring our infrastructure up to near code. And a bad decision here could waste a HALF BILLION DOLLARS, with a very negative outcome. That is, if the Realignment Alternative #4 or #6 is chosen over the Existing Alignment Alternative #1 or #3 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a plan to replace the I-70 extension from Brighton Blvd. to Pena Blvd.</p> <p>This draft (DEIS) is an extremely detailed and highly technical document of roughly 1,000 pages, with a lot of irrelevant minutia and no definitive conclusion. This makes it difficult to challenge, except for the dramatic cost difference and the potentially negative outcome. The study's sheer volume makes it impossible for the ordinary citizen to read and/or understand. While there has been some neighborhood participation, only a miniscule number of the citizens who will pay for and use the eventual highway even know that the study exists, let alone begin to comprehend its impact. In response to this massive missive, a line-item list below of some pertinent and more practical descriptions may present a much clearer understanding versus these volumes of data. This may seem a lot to read, but it addresses three volumes.</p> <p>Instead of looking for ways to spend more money that we do not have, for an option that will continue to cost more over its lifetime, CDOT should be looking for ways to reduce both short and long term costs, especially when it creates a more efficient result.</p> <p>1. The first clue to the insidious nature of this study was an early and repeated demand by the <u>then</u> Co-Director of this EIS at special committee meetings: "Not to conduct any communication with anyone outside the immediate confines of the official personnel in the study."</p>	<p>This comment was reposted on July 7, 2009 due to a typographical error that occurred during the transfer from the original letter into this comment table as it was initially posted to the I-70 web site on April 21, 2009. Our apologies to Mr. McPeck for the errors.</p>

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>Circulation of an analysis of the previous I-70, I-25 to Brighton Blvd. Environmental Assessment (EA) and the detail it presented, that was not included, rendered an inappropriate denial. (Loan of this analysis is available upon request.) Open communication in any forum leads to better understanding and a more favorable outcome.</p> <p>2. Contrary to the above "outside communication" issue, numerous conversations by concerned citizens outside the "official" realm were conducted, even to the point of modifying outcomes.</p> <p>3. One of the many impediments in the 1994 EA was that numerous elaborate and attractive architectural landscape drawings, including trees, bushes, and groomed turf, were included in the document, but were not included in the final project. This would more than imply that many similar architectural features displayed in selling this current EIS, would also not be included in the final project.</p> <p>4. During one of numerous special committee meetings, a segment on the "Impact on Institutions", was allotted all of 15 minutes. The impact on one of Colorado's greatest and oldest institutions, the National Western Stock Show and Rodeo was being discussed, but in spite of obvious interest was cut off as "out of time" and the subject was changed to something irrelevant.</p> <p>5. It is not clear who introduced the idea of extending a more expensive and impractical by-pass up through Adams county, but from some surreptitious politicking, the item got legs and became a full blown alternative. In that process, it was mentioned, that the original construction of elevated I-70 permanently and very negatively divided the neighborhoods north and south. This is certainly true, however extending much more of an elevated highway bypass north would <u>additionally</u> and more detrimentally further divide the neighborhoods east and west as well as a second north/south division. This would also destroy the historic center of Elyria.</p> <p>6. The extension north of a by-pass Alternative #4 or #6 would add many serious environmental and safety issues by detrimentally adding hundreds of thousands of accumulative daily commuter miles. Over its lifetime, this would factor to billions of unnecessary polluting miles, and wasted fuel. To this point, this very date is especially significant, as the EPA takes their first step toward requesting budgeting to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses under the Clean Air Act (attached). Under such a progression adding <u>any</u> superfluous commuter miles to <u>any</u> Federal highway project would be self defeating.</p> <p>7. The brake/acceleration aspect necessitated by the eight (considering both directions) added curves, would also add significantly to the total pollution. 7.1.5 "Mobile Source Air Toxics" in the document attempts to guess that planned improved emission control technology models would equalize the additional pollution created by future increased traffic (with no net improvement) and that variable speeds would equal essentially the same pollutant output. If true, this is of questionable significance since it, more significantly, did not consider the much more relevant added slow down/speed up aspect necessitated by the many added curves. Several times, in the EIS, including this instance, computer models are mentioned in predicting desired outcomes. In his recent letter to his Berkshire-Hathaway shareholders, Warren Buffet said: "If merely looking up past financial data would tell you what the future holds, the Forbes 400 would consist of librarians. Indeed, the stupefying losses in mortgage securities came in large part because of flawed, history based models..." "Derivatives are weapons of mass destruction." (a heavy factor in the Wall Street collapse) They were created from computer models. "Investors should be skeptical of history based models constructed by nerdy-sounding priesthood using esoteric terms... Our advice: beware of geeks bearing formulas."</p> <p>8. At the last open meeting 12-11-'08 a representative of DPS suggested that moving the by-pass north would reduce Swansea School pollution.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
73	3/25/09		McPeck	Fred	<p>Considering the prevailing west to east winds and the above additional pollution, actually the reverse would be true. Also, a small portion of the half billion dollars saved would way more than build a much needed state-of-the-art new school in the most appropriate location north of the highway. This in itself, would add a tremendous boost to the pride of the community. This would also eliminate the concern that adopting the 1 or 3 "shift north" option, using the current ROW would crowd the existing Swansea School. It would seem beneficial to all concerned for DPS officials and CDOT officials to meet to accomplish this purpose, even to the point of considering the Denver School of Science and Technology's architecture as a model. In addition the support and sharing of expenses of both CDOT and DPS should obtain the most deirable outcome.</p> <p>9. In conjunction with the above school plan, the additional greater precautions against noise, pollution and traffic confusion should be the highest priority. In a few locations, replacing blighted and surplus portions of land with parks, would be a favorable and cost effective option. All of this should be toward the goal of the least burden and most benefit to the existing neighborhood.</p> <p>10. The #1 or # 3 "shift north" option would also be the most favorable and cost effective approach to the critical Nestle-Purina location.</p> <p>11. From the greater number of lanes, at a lower cost, in the current alignment, those additional lanes would also reduce pollution by reducing the number of lane changes and stops and starts.</p> <p>12. The greater number of lanes, at a lower cost, in the existing alignment would also reduce the number of rear end collisions and the resulting stalled-traffic delays and pollution.</p> <p>13. In spite of "IMPROVED SAFETY" being designated as a major purpose of the project, adding four (actually eight considering both east and west travel), (two relatively tight), curves with potential hazardous Colorado shade glacier ice and even water accumulation, would be dangerously counterproductive. It would also necessitate an additional expense for the use of more toxic magnesium chloride and it's further destructive effect. This does, however suggest a catchy title for the by-pass alternative: "C-WRECKS".</p> <p>14. The by-pass is not only impractical from the standpoint of the above and additional land purchase, but from negating additional development, especially with RTD running near by, over a wider area, and also resulting in considerable lost tax base, that additionally, would help pay for that new school.</p> <p>15. CDOT already owing the greater portion of the existing ROW for the preferred straight-through alternative necessitates, not only less purchase process, but less cost and wasted land.</p> <p>16. Other than being noted on the accompanying map in the Vol. 6 Newsletter, the additional cost of the by-pass, it is not addressed; THAT FOR THE LOWER COST OF THE STRAIGHT-THROUGH CURRENT ALIGNMENT, <u>10 LANES ARE PROVIDED</u> VERSUS ONLY 8 LANES for the much more expensive and impractical by-pass option. This is very significant and a very long term advantage, at a much lower cost. It also multiplies the above safety and reduced pollution benefits.</p>	letter sent via certified mail to J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>17. As demonstrated by the current elevated section of I-70, especially Brighton Blvd. to York Street, the underside is rarely maintained, resulting in an unsightly, dangerous and unhealthy environment. The use of fewer bridges needed for the current ROW option helps to reduce that blight.</p> <p>18. Shortly after the completion of the latest extension of I-70 from I-25 to Brighton Blvd., a nasty weed, trash and 'transient camp' problem under the elevated highway developed. It was only a few yards from a live-alone ladies home. It took more than a year of writing, phoning and complaining to get it remedied. In the mean time transients broke into her home, and later a transient died in the camp. This is additionally indicative of what happens as excessive elevated/bridged highways are built.</p> <p>19. It does not appear that the past experience with repeated, very expensive, (the current "patch" at \$22,million) traffic stalling repair and maintenance to the current elevated/bridged section, that would be used considerably more in a by-pass option, has been factored into a lifetime cost. This is another reason for reducing the number of bridges that would be necessary with the straight line option.</p> <p>20. A timely SAFETY and SECURITY issue is less attainable for every additional elevated/bridged section that <u>has</u> to be built versus more secure surface miles. Bridges present a disproportionate vulnerability to terrorist attack and delayed recovery for critical and emergency transportation It has been stated that the by-pass option would entail considerably more bridging than the existing alignment would.</p> <p>The continued and long term vacillation and delay of this process has greatly degraded property values in the entire study area. So much so that the 80216 Zip Code has the greatest property value loss in Colorado. The process continues to cast a shadow over the entire area and it's related economic stability. Every economic factor except for taxes has been diminished disproportionately with the falling economy.</p> <p>IN CONTRAST, CONTEMPLATE THIS: The I-70 East highway is complete at the lowest cost for the least encumbered, cleanest, most efficient ecologically and most direct transition, through the existing ROW, from DIA over improved Brighton Blvd. to downtown Denver. Following that there is the maximum amount of land for new development. The "dark cloud" is lifted and Denver Planning progresses with their long promised economic and neighborhood planning for Elyria, Swansea and Globeville, that would include land to expand the National Western Complex in it's 100 year historical location, with an improved river front similar to San Antonio. It all flourishes – the new blended with the historic. This is in contrast to an over-cost, surreptitiously delayed trip to nowhere, that unnecessarily has gobbled up developable land for ever.</p> <p>This is by no means intended to be adversarial. It does, however present a simpler, more logical and pragmatic approach to an extremely important project and would over its life time, save considerable money, time and commuter frustration.</p> <p>The Elyria/Swansea/Globeville Business Association has officially supported the existing alignment alternative.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Fred McPeck 1800 Alkire Ct. Golden, CO 80401-3524 303-232-5824</p> <p>Founding Board member and past president Elyria/Swansea/Globeville Business Association Forty year business and property owner in central Elyria</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
74	3/27/09		Lee	Patrick	I support an environmental study for the I-70 Tunnel idea or viaduct revitalization. I DO NOT support the re-routing of I-70 to the north.	website
75	3/27/09		Calderon	Lisa	<p>I support an environmental study on the I-70 tunnel idea, or at the very least, support the "do nothing" plan, that would simply repair I-70 as is (continuing the current \$30 million in repairs that are being done as we speak), realizing that the responsible thing to do is NOT to create a highway structure that further damages the climate.</p> <p>I am concerned about the additional air pollution created by a new superhighway and the re-routing of an existing highway carrying more than 150,000 vehicles per day and adding thousands of miles of vehicle travel daily. Removing the current I-70 viaduct would also cause increased heavy truck traffic through the neighborhoods around Coca-Cola and all along 46th Ave.</p> <p>Many large cities have tunnels to deal with their transportation issues - why can't Denver at least study the possibility?</p>	website
76	3/27/09		Guida	Gerald	<p>I supporting Elyria's neighborhood plan that would turn a short stretch of the new I-70 into a tunnel (between Brighton Blvd. and Steele), perhaps keeping part of the viaduct as well. Keeping the south section of the viaduct for local connections would save money on the I-70 improvements and help justify the tunnel lid costs.</p> <p>Gerald Guida President Inspiration Point Neighborhood Association</p>	website
77	3/27/09		Andrews	Paul	<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>RE: I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>As executive vice president of Kroenke Sports Enterprises (KSE), I'd like to express concerns we have in regards to the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 in the draft I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). KSE is owner and operator of Dick's Sporting Goods Park, home of the Colorado Rapids soccer team and the Mile High Music Festival, in Commerce City. In looking at the proposed realignment alternatives 4 and 6 in the DEIS, we noticed that the proposed realignment alternatives will essentially take the existing six exits/interchanges on the Eastern bound stretch of I-70 from I-25 10 Quebec and narrow those down to two exits/interchanges; one at Brighton Blvd and the other at Vasquez.</p> <p>Many of our soccer and festival patrons use I-70 and I-270 to drive to our facility for events. Narrowing the amount of possible road alternatives our patrons have to choose from will only compound our already existing traffic problems along 56th and Quebec Parkway. Should 4 or 6 be the preferred CDOT alternative, KSE will insist that additional interchange improvements be made at the Vasquez Boulevard/56th Avenue interchange at I-270. We will also insist that other local road improvements throughout Commerce City be studied immediately and presented to the public for review and comment prior to the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and record of decision (ROD).</p> <p>I'd also like to comment on the existing realignment study area. We believe the area you used to study these alternatives did not take into consideration many of the areas in Commerce City, including Dick's Sporting Goods Park, that may be adversely impacted by the realignment.</p>	letter sent to J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>Therefore, we recommend you expanded the study area further north and further east of the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 to allow for a comprehensive analysis and public review and comment of their impacts on traffic and air quality on our facility prior to issuance of the FEIS and ROD.</p> <p>Sincerely, Paul Andrews</p>	
78	3/27/09		Burds	Jimmy	<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>RE: I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: As president of the Commerce City Business and Professional Association (CCBPA), and as a local business owner in Commerce City, I'd like to express concerns we have in regards to the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 presented in the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). CCBPA is extremely concerned about the possible negative impacts on businesses that may result should CDOT choose alternative 4 or alternative 6 as its preferred option.</p> <p>It is our understanding that approximately 25 businesses who employ almost 3,000 people will be impacted by the proposed realignment of I-70. There is a high possibility that these businesses, when asked to move, will relocate outside of Commerce City. CCBPA also is concerned about the realignment alternatives, which fail to take into consideration traffic impacts to local roads. High volumes of traffic along these roads, in addition to heavy traffic along I-270 in both directions, is a major issue for our businesses. Alternatives 4 or 6 do not adequately address our traffic concerns. Therefore, CDOT needs to expand the current study area further north of the realignment alternatives to allow for a comprehensive analysis and public review of the adverse impacts this may have on our businesses. Thank you for your time and feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jimmy Burds President Commerce City Business and Professional Association 720-261-1225 8025 Pontiac Street, Commerce City, Colorado 80022 jimmyb@colographic.com</p>	letter sent to J. Bemelen
					<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>RE: I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation, FHWA-CO-EIS-08-02-D</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: On behalf of Adams County Economic Development, Inc. (ACED), I'd like to express concerns we have in regards to the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 presented in the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).</p> <p>Adams County will be the fastest growing county in Colorado for the next 20 years according to forecasts by the Denver Regional Council of Governments. Almost half the employment growth in the metro region will be in Adams County and the urban core. How CDOT plans for future growth and transportation needs is extremely important to ACED, its investors, and its local government partners.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
79	3/27/09	ACED	Becker	Bill	<p>As we see it, the proposed realignment alternatives will take the existing six exits on the Eastern bound stretch of I-70, from I-25 to Quebec, and narrow those down to two interchanges in the proposed realignment. High volumes of traffic along I-270 in both directions has and continues to be an issue for many of ACED's investors and partners. We fear this apparent lack of exit/interchange alternatives for commuters will only increase the current traffic issues. Additionally, the alternatives fail to take into consideration traffic impacts to local roads, which will impact Adams County businesses.</p> <p>ACED is also concerned about the potential impacts of the realignment on businesses and jobs. The City of Commerce City has provided us with information that nearly 25 businesses that employ approximately 3,000 people will be impacted by the proposed realignment. ACED is extremely concerned that these businesses, when asked to move as a result of the realignment, will relocate to areas outside of the city or the county.</p> <p>In order to address concerns noted in this letter, we strongly advocate that CDOT expand the current study area further north of the realignment alternatives. This will allow for a comprehensive analysis and public review of the adverse impacts this may have on business, the city, and the county.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bill Becker</p>	letter sent to J. Bemelen
80	3/28/09		Calderon	Elaine	I am in support of an environmental study on the I-70 tunnel idea. But more so, I support the "do nothing plan" to simply repair I-70 and NOT to create a highway structure that further damages the climate.	website
81	3/28/09		Rose	Kathryn	I think it is best to leave I-70 where it is. Fix it the best way available, then encourage people to use public transit or bicycles to commute as much as possible.	website
82	3/28/09		Angell	Jim	<p>I want to voice my support for conducting an environmental study examining the option of building a tunnel between Brighton and Steele streets instead of simply expanding the highway in this area. In the alternative, I would prefer to simply maintain the highway at its current size rather than expand it. As a resident of Cole neighborhood, I would prefer to see an innovative and progressive solution to highway transport needs--such as a tunnel--rather than a wider I-70 running through several residential communities.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jim Angell</p>	Contact Us e-mail
83	3/29/09		M-Zee	Cha Ka Tana Kh	<p>I am supporting the I-70 environmental impact statement study.</p> <p>Thank you much. Cha Ka</p>	website
					<p>I would like to voice my agreement with the comments given by Loralie Cole in the below letter. In particular, I am concerned with the potential thousands of extra vehicle miles caused by the extension of I-70 via diversion to I-270, and I would like to see additional consideration given to the idea of running part of I-70 belowground.</p> <p>Best Regards; Eric Branton (Loralie's letter below)</p> <p>Dear Members and Friends of the Cole Neighborhood Association,</p> <p>I would like to remind you that the public comment time for the I-70 environmental impact statement ends on March 31, so if you haven't yet submitted your comments, please consider learning about the issues and giving some input</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
84	3/30/09		Branton	Eric	<p>Even if you don't live in northeast Denver, this issue affects you in several ways. I would ask you to consider supporting Elyria's neighborhood plan that would turn a short stretch of the new I-70 into a tunnel (between Brighton Blvd. and Steele), perhaps keeping part of the viaduct as well. Keeping the south section of the viaduct for local connections would save money on the I-70 improvements and help justify the tunnel lid costs. This visionary idea is far superior to the creation of a new, six-mile section that would divert traffic north to I-270 for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The loss of the National Western Stock Show Complex would be tragic to our area. It's one of the yearly events that makes Denver the great and historic place that it is, and it's the only major event that's within walking distance of our northeast neighborhoods.</p> <p>2) It might be possible to correlate the air filtration system of the tunnel with the air filtration system of the new, 50,000 square foot automated Purina expansion. If you're like me, you're not looking forward to the day that plant goes into production.</p> <p>If a study were done, we might know if air quality improvements could incorporate Purina.</p> <p>3) In a world on the brink of massive climate change, the addition of forcing traffic two extra miles per trip - and thereby creating 450,000 ADDITIONAL VEHICLE MILES per day - is irresponsible, even unthinkable. It more than doubles the saved emissions from the vehicles removed once the EMU train route goes to the airport.</p> <p>4) The concurrent North Metro Rail study recommends a commuter rail stop at 46th and Brighton Blvd., which would be impossible to create if there were a diversion of traffic to I-270. As most people might understand, no neighborhood would want to forego a commuter rail stop in favor of a superhighway.</p> <p>5) Removing the current I-70 viaduct would also cause increased heavy truck traffic through the neighborhoods around Coca-Cola and all along 46th Ave.</p> <p>6) Many large cities have tunnels to deal with their transportation issues (in some places, I believe they're called subways). Even Vail looked into tunnel options for I-70.</p> <p>Even though you might not live in or near Elyria, Swansea, or Globeville, the additional air pollution created by a new superhighway will affect you anywhere in Denver. We're not talking about creating a new road where there was none; we're talking about re-routing an existing road carrying more than 150,000 vehicles per day and adding thousands of miles of vehicle travel daily.</p> <p>Please, write in your support of an environmental study on the I-70 tunnel idea, or at the very least, support the "do nothing" plan, that would simply repair I-70 as is (continuing the current \$30 million in repairs that are being done as we speak), realizing that the responsible thing to do is NOT to create a highway structure that further damages the climate.</p> <p>Submit your comments by March 31, 2009 to:</p> <p>http://www.i-70east.com/index.shtml</p> <p>Thank you, Loralie Cole, Resident Cole Neighborhood</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
85	3/30/09		Ozinga	Kelly	<p>I would like to comment in favor of an environmental study for the I70 tunnel proposal. As a resident of the area, added traffic congestion near the coca cola plant as well as a diversion of traffic from I 70 would have extremely negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>Also, being 10-15 blocks away from the Purina plant, summertime breezes are not so pleasant. I would love to see some kind of ventilation so we can enjoy backyard barbeques without the dreadful smell of animal by products. It was not something that I was aware of when we purchased our home, but could have impacted our purchasing decision, had I known that the plant produced such horrible smells. I wonder what effects that the fumes are having on our air quality.</p> <p>My husband and I use the exits in question quite often, and I do think that it will be rather inconvenient to drive an extra mile or two just to get home.</p> <p>Please take in consideration the residents, business owners, and the environment when making this decision.</p>	website
86	3/30/09		Dissel	Scott	<p>Dear Mr. Bemelen-</p> <p>I live near I-70 west, and also have been involved in issues regarding alignment of the C-470 beltline in Golden.</p> <p>Please reconsider your alternatives for the eastbound alignment of I-70. The rejection of a tunnel forces several choices that will only lead to increased noise, surface traffic, and/or increased vehicle miles, all of which are less desirable than a tunnel alternative.</p> <p>Freeways, regardless of where (or how high above ground) they are located are a short-term, environmentally unsound alternative to the need for transportation.</p> <p>Putting freeways underground, limiting the number of lanes, and increasing public mass transit wherever possible are the best alternative for the most people.</p> <p>Thank you. Scott Dissel</p>	website
87	3/30/09		Danek	Paul	<p>I vote for an environmental study on the I-70 tunnel idea, or at the very least, support the "do nothing" plan, that would simply repair I-70 as is. I think the proposal to add a northern "loop" of additional pavement is asinine. Thank you</p>	website
					<p>If it is not already, CDOT's Mission Statement should read, "To move all vehicular traffic safely, efficiently, and with minimal disruption, with roadway projects accomplished at the most affordable cost to the taxpaying public."</p> <p>The re-construction and improvement of Interstate 70 in it's current location is, without question, the only project that would satisfy all of the Mission Statement requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current location "Straight through" traffic safety would be improved due to enhancements and technology in roadway design not available in the roughly 50 years since the original highway was constructed. 2. A complicated gore point at the connection of the proposed re-alignment to I-270 would prove to be another nightmare in rush hour in good weather, and worse when snow, ice, or fog conditions exist. The inefficiency of adding several unnecessary travel miles is pure folly. 	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
88	3/30/09		Branstetter	Leo	<p>In these times of "green" thinking, incalculable amounts of wasted fuel and toxic tailpipe emissions over the 50+ year lifespan of the rerouted highway would be a disastrous result to be forced on the citizens of the Denver Metro area.</p> <p>3. As proven after the California earthquakes, many miles of existing roads and bridges can be rebuilt and improved in a relatively short time. With a focused effort on the existing I-70 alignment, the disruption in rebuilding and improving the highway will cause far less impact in time and trouble in the affected neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea.</p> <p>4. Considering the terrible condition of the U.S. economy in general, and Colorado's dim financial outlook, it is insulting to consider spending the estimated additional 500 Million Dollars to relocate the highway. The FastTrax commuter rail system debacle currently is in total disarray due to lack of planned funding, and that project may only be completed (with many promised features deleted) if the citizens are forced into further tax increases.</p> <p>For the above reasons, relocating I-70 in any direction will result in no proven benefits, and a financial loss to taxpayers.</p> <p>Having enjoyed a successful 35 year career in the center of the Elyria neighborhood, I know that a rebuilt and improved I-70 in its existing alignment will guarantee a far superior project outcome for Taxpaying Citizens and motorists alike.</p> <p>Leo Branstetter PMC Land, LLC 4700 Brighton Boulevard Denver, Colorado 80216 303-477-1423 / 303-501-4801</p>	Contact Us e-mail
89	3/30/09	Forest City	Brown	Derek	<p>Please accept the following comment for the I-70 East Draft EIS.</p> <p>Reference all corridor Alternatives in relation to Section 4 of the Study Area; specifically how the alternatives affect Stapleton redevelopment. The corridor alternatives indicate in Exhibits 3-28, 30, 32, 34, 36 & 38 that collector-distributor roads are provided within Section 4. However, the text associated with each of these Exhibits indicates that C-D roads are only provided from Havana to I-225; while follow-on text (Level Four screening) suggests the C-D roads east of Havana were eliminated. Further, and in specific relation to the Central Park Blvd interchange, Exhibit 3-40 entitled Interchange Forms and Locations suggests graphically that a C-D roadway system may be contemplated on either side of Central Park Blvd. Please clarify whether a C-D roadway is contemplated along the Stapleton Redevelopment frontage to I-70.</p> <p>Should this remain a component of any Alternative, please clarify the extent to which geometry of the C-D roads east of Central Park Blvd could be designed tighter to mainline I-70 to fall within current allocated land area (in the redevelopment plan) for widening of I-70.</p> <p>As presented / conceived the C-D roads east of Central Park Blvd suggest an unacceptable incursion into the development – either developable property or as trunk open space under the Stapleton Redevelopment. As currently depicted, the C-D roadway would run directly through a newly constructed building that fronts existing I-70 (which was set back a planned distance to accommodate widening of the Interstate). Should a design solution present itself that either eliminates the C-D roads altogether or holds them tighter to mainline I-70, there is an opportunity to either eliminate or substantially mitigate property acquisitions within Stapleton that would otherwise be necessary to construct the C-D road system.</p> <p>Should any developable property be required or impacted in this section of the project, this would be of tremendous concern to the redevelopment effort because the property affected is high-value commercial property that underpins long-term revenues flowing from the development.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this in more detail please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks Derek Brown</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
90	3/30/09	Forest City	Brown	Derek	<p>Please accept the following comment for the I-70 East Draft EIS.</p> <p>Chapter 3 – Reference Exhibit 3-42 regarding Existing Alignment Alternative Laneage Refinements. This alternative discusses adding 2-lanes in each direction, but the Figure depicting this alternative only adds 1-lane in each direction (5-lanes total in each direction versus 4-lanes in the existing condition). Constructing 2-lanes, and leaving one striped out (a la I-225 widening in Aurora), is contrary to the Needs defined for the study. Please clarify how the 2-lanes are achieved. Further, please clarify amount of ROW required to provide the additional laneage. It should be noted that any property acquisitions that are not presently anticipated within Stapleton redevelopment master plan would affect high-value commercial properties that underpin long-term revenues flowing from the redevelopment. This issue is also discussed in another comment submitted separately via e-mail and entitled "Comments to the I-70 East EIS - Collector Distributor Road from Central Park Blvd to Havana."</p> <p>If you have any questions concerning this comment, or need to discuss it in further detail, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks Derek Brown</p>	Contact Us e-mail
91	3/30/09	Forest City	Brown	Derek	<p>Please accept the following comment for the I-70 East Draft EIS.</p> <p>Regarding the Tolloed Alternatives. These alternatives seem to have a consequence of forcing more traffic out onto surface streets for those users who would choose not to sustain interstate delays or pay tolls (unless these lanes were managed to include HOVs to use the facility at no cost). In the context of Stapleton redevelopment this increases pressure on new infrastructure projects and connections absent the additional funding sources or tolling opportunities that are available to a Federal Highway project. Please advise how these effects have been anticipated and are proposed to be addressed.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this in more detail please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks Derek Brown</p>	Contact Us e-mail
92	3/30/09	Forest City	Brown	Derek	<p>Please accept the following comment for the I-70 East Draft EIS.</p> <p>Section 5.9 regarding Park Lands and Open Space. The text of this section suggests that the entire open space / landscape and trail buffer in the NW quadrant of CPB / I-70 would be consumed by the various Alternatives. This is not consistent with our recent and ongoing dialog regarding planning / accommodations for this area. Please provide details indicating / disclosing the extent of disturbance / acquisition proposed for the various alternatives.</p> <p>Section 5.14 regarding Flood Plains and Drainage. Be advised that a Letter of Map Revision is being processed for the reach of Sand Creek across the Stapleton frontage that will alter the modeling that's depicted in the EIS. The general effect of the LOMR is to reduce the overall effects of flooding in this area. A copy of the LOMR can be made available on request or through CCD.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this in more detail please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks Derek Brown</p>	Contact Us e-mail
93	3/30/09		Van Pelt	Grant	<p>I believe that the I-70 eastern corridor is in need of rethinking. However, re-routing traffic to I-270 is wasteful on many levels, and could be a detriment to the quality of life "on the ground" in northeast Denver. Please consider "doing nothing," or perhaps routing traffic through a tunnel/ series of tunnels. This would preserve the quality of life and meet transit needs simultaneously.</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
94	3/30/09		Weiss	Noah	<p>Dear James Bemelen and other DEIS preparers,</p> <p>I am writing to give my comments on the proposed draft environmental impact statement for the I-70 east corridor proposed for the Denver metro area. I have a few specific comments about the DEIS which I would like to share with you for inclusion in the public record and for your consideration during the final EIS and ROD making processes. Please take my comments, listed below into serious consideration during your planning and decision making process.</p> <p>I would like to first say that I support the no action alternative, among the 7 alternatives referenced in the DEIS. While it is well hidden within the DEIS, the alternative where no action is taken on expanding I-70 through Denver is clearly the most environmentally responsible and best option given what we know about global climate change, the finite supply of oil, and the impact increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has on surrounding communities. The last thing we need is larger roads which will only increase traffic and pollution, as well as increase petroleum consumption.</p> <p>First, the DEIS needs to consider seriously the impact that any rerouting of I-70 which increases the length of the road also increases VMT, pollution, and petroleum use. The three alternatives which propose to reroute I-70 increase VMT beyond reasonable acceptable levels and should be withdrawn from the EIS. No alternative which increases VMT while functionally moving traffic the same distance as the current route should not be considered. The EIS needs to seriously consider the environmental impact of any increase in VMT, either due to the reroute or to increasing traffic lanes.</p> <p>The DEIS does not sufficiently explore a covered roadway option such as a shallow bore tunnel or cut and cover below grade option as possible alternatives. The EIS needs to consider these options and the reduced negative impacts which they could have on the local community. These below grade lanes could be used as express lanes (in conjunction with the current structure) to limit the need for connection to grade and limited sight distances. You need to state the physical dimensions of the tunnel option which you rule out (especially depth) so we know what you are considering.</p> <p>A tunnel option would be the best option for the community, and therefore needs to be considered. The EIS needs to take into account other transportation plans for the affected areas, including light rail stations and community access. The reroute plans would go over the proposed location of a light rail station (see the Elyria vision plan 2020) and would effectively isolate the Globeville neighborhood from Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods. This will cause a significant negative impact on these neighborhoods and their long term viability needs to be a major factor in the EIS and any ROD.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and for taking my comments into consideration. I look forward to seeing the EIS including the above comments and for the planners to choose the best option, which is the no action alternative.</p> <p>Sincerely, Noah Weiss</p>	website
95	3/30/09	Suncor	Gallagher	John	<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: Suncor Energy's Comments on the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation, FHWA-CO-EIS-08-02-D</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: On behalf of Suncor Energy (U.S.A) Inc., I'd like to express concerns we have in regards to the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 presented in the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Suncor is located south of I-270 in Commerce City and utilizes Brighton Road, Colorado Boulevard/Vazquez Boulevard and 56th Avenue in Commerce to access I-270 and I-76. Suncor's business is contingent upon easy access to and from our facilities by our workers, customers, vendors, product transportation, and emergency equipment.</p>	letter forwarded by T. Stewart via e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>I-270 and the local roadways are already severely congested. Adding the additional traffic due to the realignment will only compound these problems. In Suncor's initial review of the alternatives 4 and 6 as presented in DEIS, we are concerned that the proposed alternative 4 and 6 could have the potential to severely limit access to and from our facility due to the likelihood of increased traffic in the area.</p> <p>In addition, we recommend that the area CDOT used to study these alternatives should be expanded further north of the realignment alternatives 4 and 6 to allow for comprehensive analysis of their impacts on traffic and air quality as it relates to our operations.</p> <p>Sincerely, John Gallagher VP Refining & Pipelines</p>	
96	3/31/09		Sandy	Catherine	<p>I know about the developers control over this whole area and the situation. The systematic Gentrification of all of our low income neighborhoods is way out of control. Refusing to truly examine and evaluate ALL POSSIBLE SCENARIOS, is irresponsible and a blatant abuse of our tax dollars. The taxpayers and residents will be paying for this boondoggle in all ways. To favor and reward yet another developer/land owner, over the people who are trying to live and exist in the only area they can afford is criminal. AND, how does this "diversion of I-70 " play out in the "greening- o- Denver"? Where is Green Print Denver in this land grab? It's more polluting, gas wasting, and ridiculous. I would hate to think that a possible injunction would be the way to have the people and their desirable option heard, have you considered that could happen as a response to being run over and ignored? Who knows'. How nice it would of been if the RNO's there could of received 8 million dollar's also, to help them fight for their home's and neighborhood's.</p> <p>Wow, imagine that, taxpayer dollars going back to help taxpayers and not to land owners/developers who could care less about who they "pave over" ,,,,,, Thank's,,,, Catherine Sandy</p>	Contact Us e-mail
97	3/31/09		Elliott	Joe	<p>Dear Mr. Bemelen,</p> <p>I wanted to take the opportunity to share my thoughts and opinions about the impact that expanding I-70 on it's current route would have. I do not support any alternative to re-alignment.</p> <p>I have been a resident and homeowner in the Swansea neighborhood for the past 6 years. It is my strong conviction that the realignment of I-70 out of my neighborhood would have a profoundly positive impact that would allow the neighborhood to emerge from the multi generational affects of poverty, racism, and disparity, and have a chance at the American dream.</p> <p>From my perspective there has been a long history for urban planners to do the right thing by the residents of this neighborhood and time and time again they have chosen to saddle us with the burdens of toxic pollution, a dangerous and disruptive industrial atmosphere, and the limiting of mobility due to highways and railyards. The neighborhood has 'always' been a type of dumping ground for the necessary infrastructure to maintain urban life- such as highways, landfills, power stations, refineries, railroad facilities, industry, waste water treatment, etc.</p> <p>The consistently oppressive treatment the neighborhood has received can be explained in no other way than by the dynamic of racism-as residents of this neighborhood have always been of immigrant origin, and have been loyal to their ethnic customs and culture.</p> <p>Because the leadership has shown a collective apathy towards the citizens of this neighborhood, that apathy has taken root in the very dynamics of the families in this neighborhood as Elyria/Swansea has becoming a breeding ground for crime, violence, and urban decay.</p> <p>A couple of examples are the following: When I have friends visit me at my home I feel I must prepare them for entry into a community in which the normal laws, respect for property, and respect for other citizens does not apply- not in practice.</p> <p>When friends come to my neighborhood I tell them that they must first prepare to exit I-70 via York, a turn so poorly planned and so dangerous that the evidence of accidents at this juncture is evident on a bi-weekly basis.</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>I know this to be true as I see evidence of the destroyed buffers positioned at the right-angle of the exit on a bi-weekly basis!</p> <p>I tell them that they will see evidence of at least three gangs that have marked their territory so clearly, that you can see their insignias on every block surrounding my residence. I tell my friends not to bring their dogs with them because of the ferrel dogs and cats that frequent the neighborhood, not to mention the pit bull breeds that are numerous in this area. I tell my friends not to leave valuables in their car because the police will not respond if their car is broken into-due to it being an all to frequent crime with an unlikely chance that the perpetrator will be caught. There are countless other examples that make this neighborhood at the least a traumatizing experience that leaves scars on children and families and at most like a 'ghetto enclave' with little application of local laws or generally accepted standards of fairness.</p> <p>I support the realignment of I-70 because it would begin to impart some evidence of fairness and parity within the Denver Community.</p> <p>I deeply believe that the greatest value of the land that we live in, of America is the notion that wherever you come from and whatever your limitations are, that if you work hard and pay your dues, that you will be rewarded. The people in this neighborhood have been paying their dues for a long time, they have learned to live with the ugly realities of what it takes make a city functional, but as Martin Luther King once said, 'Justice too long delayed is justice denied'. While I am sure that the realignment of I-70 and the beautification of the neighborhood would allow lot of residents to live their dreams, I can't imagine how I and my neighbors will endure another one of the countless blows that we have been asked to take for the growth and health of the city of Denver.</p> <p>Thanks, Joe Elliott, M.A. 4670 Fillmore St. Denver, CO 80216</p>	
98	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Elyria Neighborhood is going to be sending in some supporting data electronically to hold down copying costs. We do plan a hand delivery today as well. (see attachment)</p> <p>This one is the Gauterman study on Highway Effects on Lung Development published in the Lancet. It is on the basis of this an other studies and factors that we believe special consideration is due along the 8 block corridor transecting residential north Denver neighborhoods.</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
99	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Here is a synopsis of a study conducted by UCLA on the relationship between diesel particulate pollution and cardiovascular problems, including atherosclerosis, heart attacks and pulmonary disease. (see attachment)</p> <p>The study found that a 6% rise in heart and lung related DEATHS for every 10 mcg/cm rise in particulate pollution.</p> <p>The study also found that diesel particulate pollution had a 50% negative synergy increase when combined with fatty cholesterol in the diet.</p> <p>We believe these new findings argue for increased protection of nearby residences, which is why we have insisted the tunnel concept we submitted first in 2005 will solve the worst aspects of our negative highway impacts in the North Neighborhoods. Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
100	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please see for inclusion in the I-70 East Corridor DEIS the enclosed power point program created by Elyria Neighborhood Association for the purpose of explaining the value of locating the North Metro Denver Station at 48th and Brighton Blvd.</p> <p>We are also enclosing the e-mail from the project engineer confirming there is "general consensus" that this location is the prime and preferred site for the Denver North Metro FasTracks station in the opinion of the North Metro project team. (see attachment)</p> <p>This site is literally under the footprint your I-70 Highway Realignment Alternatives would create; in short, your proposal to realign the highway for "environmental justice" reasons would eliminate the chance our neighborhoods have of re-connecting via transit; yet another reason we support the Tunnel alternative on the current alignment as shown in the Elyria 2020 Vision Plan.</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	E-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
101	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please find attached a chart of Denver Foreclosures tracked through time. Notice Elyria Neighborhood since 2005: the year your project team web-sited the proposed realignment of I-70 down Williams Street in Elyria.</p> <p>You may think it's a coincidence, however, most people don't want to risk buying a house that may wind up with a 12 lane superhighway in its front yard, unless it's for \$36,000 in a foreclosure auction (see the second nearest house to the preferred North Metro FasTracks Station location, sold this month; Denver home sales sheet attached.) (see attachment)</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
102	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please accept in this attachment the Elyria 2020 Vision Plan and its Citizen-proposed Tunnel Alternative. This means of addressing the needed I-70 capacity and safety issues will best respect the local communities while improving service levels.</p> <p>By minimizing the Interstate Highway impacts locally, the neighborhoods can pursue the future best suited to their inherent attributes. Our goal is for the majority of local residents to have the opportunity to support this concept in writing by supporting the neighborhood plan. Believe it or not, nearly everyone in the neighborhood likes the tunnel idea and the notion that the remaining homes and Swansea Elementary School will have a park strip instead of a thundering river of traffic.</p> <p>I am also attaching the tunnel alternatives represented to have been studied by your EIS team in their feasibility and costing analysis. As you can see the diagram with the stacked tunnel design does not leave room for "existing 46th to dip under the UP. Therefore, the diagram itself is bogus. (see attachment)</p> <p>The conclusion that we'll drain the Platte River into the tunnel and "harm the aquatic life" is preposterous.</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
103	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please accept for inclusion in the I-70 East Corridor EIS the enclosed Op-ed pieces chronicling the ongoing struggle of the neighborhood your study team can't seem to realize exists. (see attachment)</p> <p>>Tom Anthony, President >Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
104	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen"</p> <p>This is a report by the Piton Foundation stating the average home loan in Elyria and Swansea in 2003 was over \$157,000. (see attachment)</p> <p>Our rate of sub-prime loans was lower than the metro average.</p> <p>Since your highway alignment proposal, our homes have lost an average of 70% of their value, although the North Metro FasTracks station siting should have caused an increase in speculative buying. I won't bother to send the "comparable sales" data from last summer I commissioned. Pretty much the only sales going on in Elyria nowadays are foreclosures.</p> <p>What do you think is going through the home buyers' heads here in Elyria? Could anyone actually think CDOT might be seriously considering putting a permanent 2-mile commute detour in I-70 down Williams Street and calling it a transportation improvement?</p> <p>>Tom Anthony, President >Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
105	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>Mr. James Bemelen East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please include the attached exhibit to the 10 page "commentary" ("10-page commentary" is included as attachment to comment 107) submitted by Elyria Neighborhood Association re: the I-70 East Corridor DEIS. (see attachment)</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
106	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Please include the attached graphic showing current Denver housing development patterns with Elyria's comments. (see attachment)</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
107	3/31/09		Anthony	Tom	<p>James Bemelen CDOT East Corridor I-70 DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>These are the summary comments we are making, with two backup articles, one from Brookings Fellow Robert Puentes titled: "Strengthening the Ability of Public Transportation to Reduce Our Dependence on Foreign Oil," and one from Evan Pauls of the Northeast Midwest Institute titled: "Energy Benefits of Urban Infill, Brownfields, and Sustainable Urban Development." (see attachment)</p> <p>The point of these three pieces is to help assemble for you the vision Elyria residents have of their future and how our place in that future can be something besides a footprint for a new superhighway and a repository for waste, waiting for the recycler. In fact, that by using our proximity to jobs, transit, transportation and industrial infrastructure, how we can help the metro area conserve vast quantities of energy through efficient urban planning.</p> <p>Our vision is for a thriving multi-use urban area along the Platte River Greenway, full utilization of North Side Park and the Riverside Cemetery areas, and a bustling community within the central core of Denver.</p> <p>Tom Anthony, President Elyria Neighborhood Association</p>	Contact Us e-mail
108	3/31/2009		Lombard-Hunt	Lynne	I am not in favor and would like to see other options explored.	website
109	3/31/2009		Miller	Rick	I am opposed to the closing of York Street, as this will force traffic through the Cole neighborhood, as well as increase the route miles cars must make, resulting in increases auto emissions, having a negative environmental effect.	website
					<p>Mr. James Bemelen Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, Colorado 80222</p> <p>Mr. Chris Horn Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement Evaluation for I-70 East Project</p> <p>Dear Messrs. Bemelen and Horn:</p> <p>I am a resident of the Elyria neighborhood in Denver, living at 4653 High Street in September 2007. I am an architect and planner by profession. I have reviewed the draft EIS on the CDOT website, and have many serious concerns about your review of alternatives. I also do not feel you have seriously considered all options most importantly the option of submerging the highway in a tunnel for a short one mile length and your reasons for this are specious at best and at worst negligent and extremely harmful.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
110	3/31/2009		Dutcher	Drew	<p>When I-70 was built in the 1960 s (I was a child at the time), the highway severed Elyria and Swansea from the rest of the city, and split Globeville in two. In addition to consigning residents of these neighborhoods to permanent neglect by city officials and agencies, they were condemned to breathe polluted air, and I believe the resultant serious health problems have been documented and well-proven. Rather than exacerbate or perpetuate this terrible inequity, I believe it is time for the city and the state to correct a long-standing injustice, and improve the quality of life for city residents, instead of just thinking about users of I-70.</p> <p>I attended a public meeting in Swansea on December 13 of last year, where CDOT presented its alternatives. The tunnel option, put forth by Elyria Neighborhood Association, was dismissed outright (and arrogantly), without any serious explanation.</p> <p>Opposition to the re-alignment option was voiced by numerous attendees, and the presenters tried to look like they understood, but I personally feel our opinions were ignored or dismissed, and that CDOT did not really listen and did not really care what our neighborhoods thought.</p> <p>The alternatives you do consider do not really analyze the permanent damage done to our communities in two important ways: 1) the health hazards from the additional pollution from additional lanes and 2) the disastrous effects to the cohesion of neighborhoods and their relation to the greater city.</p> <p>In short, your public process has been a sham. You seem to only consider highway users and not residents and workers in areas that the highway cuts through.</p> <p>It is NOT apparent to me anywhere in the EIS that any of the city s plans (Blueprint Denver, for just one example) were consulted or studied. I do not seriously believe the I-70 re-alignment (or any alternative) has been coordinated with and integrated into other transit systems and nodes, and certainly not with the Fastracks commuter rail and its proposed stop locations.</p> <p>I demand that CDOT and other involved agencies look at new options which do not divide and pollute our community. The best alternative I have seen is the tunnel option put forth by the Elyria Neighborhood Association. This has near universal appeal to all residents of Elyria and Swansea, and can allow for the re-vitalization and re-integration of these neglected neighborhoods, which have enormous potential (I know this because I have walked streets and knocked on doors in Elyria and Swansea). Your reasons for eliminating this are another sham: it s very apparent you never seriously studied it.</p> <p>It is high time for CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration to correct the errors and harm done to Elyria and Swansea in the 1960 s, and participate in a public process that helps Denver become a livable city with vibrant, thriving communities.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Drew Dutcher 4653 High Street Denver, CO 80216 303.477.9156 x12 (work) 303.349.4360 (cell) drew@studiocompletiva.com</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
111	3/31/2009		Chapin	Karen	<p>Open up lanes to the same width and number as in the improved section from I-25 to Brighton Blvd. Improve exits along elevated I-70.</p> <p>Re-alignment of I-70 along Brighton Blvd. and I-270 would add miles for those traveling through. It would be an improvement for those living and working in the Swansea/Elyria neighborhood.</p> <p>Leaving I-70 in its current location would result in fewer miles for those traveling through and would provide a new school for the neighborhood. It would displace many people from their homes, businesses and the historic location of Swansea School. It would also continue to divide and disrupt the neighborhood.</p> <p>Given all of this, I think the re-alignment of the highway along Brighton Blvd. and I-270 would be the best alternative for the people living and working in the Swansea/Elyria neighborhood and would not be too much more of a drive for those traveling through.</p>	Feedback Form
112	3/31/2009			Karla	<p>First of all, I would like to say that I don't live around Swansea but I do work at Our Lady of Grace Church which is in the Swansea Neighborhood. I feel that most of the residents to Swansea have no idea of the huge impact this project will cause. An elementary school will be taken down along with many homes and small businesses. I do believe in change and in making our city a better and improved city but I also believe that it isn't fair for so many people to have to abandon what they have been calling home for many many years; for instance our oldest Parishioner Cy Lujan has lived in this neighborhood for over 50 years. I do hope however that whatever is done in this project is done under consideration of the Swansea Community because after all this community will suffer the consequences that this project will bring. Further more, I do wish the best of luck to all who are participating in this big development.</p>	website
113	3/31/2009		Williams	Liz	<p>I am a teacher at Swansea Elementary; this is my 12th year. I do NOT want home destroyed and families displaced nor do I want Swansea Elementary moved. I understand the alternative is a loop around the neighborhood going north and rejoining I70 as 270 melds into it. Thank you Liz Williams</p>	Contact Us e-mail
114	3/31/2009		Lane	Norman	<p>For thirty-nine years I have lived in the Clayton Neighborhood. The impact of any significant widening of I-70 through the Elyria and Globeville neighborhoods, I would take as offensive to the Historic fabric and importance of this as an ethnic area and its place in the mining and smelting that built this state.</p> <p>It is time that history and people be afforded primacy over the convenience of commuters and truck traffic with its offensive noise and smell. While we are trying to transition to a quieter more energy-efficient base of economy, now does not seem the time to use 1990 solutions.</p> <p>Norman C Lane 3330 Bruce Randolph Avenue Denver CO 80205</p>	Contact Us e-mail

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
115	3/31/2009		Hamby	Vaughn	<p>I would like to re-iterate that originally, we thought that diverting the traffic to I-270 might be the preferable idea, but now that the EIS has been released and the environment has changed so much in the past two years, and global warming is considered a human-influenced environmental tragedy, adding so many unnecessary vehicle miles is clearly a travesty. I don't believe that there are any environmental groups that support diverting the traffic to I-270.</p> <p>"Removing" the highway from one section of the neighborhood where industry has developed along 46th Ave. for decades (e.g.: Purina, Coca-Cola, Manna-Pro, etc., etc.) to put in it a new part of the neighborhood makes very little sense. All of the heavy truck traffic that currently uses I-70 will now be using neighborhood routes through Cole and Clayton. This would be a HUGE IMPACT on surrounding neighborhoods FOREVER.</p> <p>We support the "No Action" option, or a tunnel option that maintains at least part of the viaduct for industry and local access.</p> <p>Loralie Cole 3609 Lafayette Street Denver, CO 80205</p> <p>Vaughn Hamby P.O. Box 261295 Lakewood, CO 80226</p>	Contact Us e-mail
116	3/31/2009		Glazier	Rich	<p>After reading the alternatives proposed in the (what I believe is) latest EIS draft, I feel the shift north proposal is the best alternative for commuters, new highway design, and neighborhoods rebirth and over all health and safety, and promotes development opportunities for the neighborhoods and city.</p> <p>Having said that, I feel the Elyria "tunnel" proposal accomplishes these goals with less disruption, upheaval, eminent domain issues, and potentially cost. I can imagine an inner city interstate highway tunnel to be quite an engineering feat, but what a win-win alternative this could be if somehow realized! I just can't imagine that a small section of tunnel could be more difficult or expensive than miles and miles of new elevated and surface highway construction.</p>	website
117	3/31/2009		Lucero	Carol	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>How will all of this affect the present community and the students and employees at Swansea Elementary. Is anyone taken these factors into consideration. When will all this construction take place and what will the results of all this be. I am concerned about not only the students but myself as a teacher at Swansea. I would like more information.</p>	website
118	3/31/2009		Lovato	Geralyn	<p>The community organization of Globeville representative speaks out "Dennis Lovato has a birds eye view of what it would take to make it necessary to reroute our highway transit system." County officials please!! Take notice of this proposal and help aid those surrounding communities as well as the people visiting our beautiful state of Colorado. The tax payers have definitely paid their dues for better highways and transit. Our children's futures depend on the corrective action we take today and on the suggested alternatives of the ordinary people like Dennis. He's made a point which could clearly be demonstrated for the cause. Five years is not far away.</p>	website
119	3/31/2009		Macdonald	Arlene	<p>I really do believe displacing 90 families and businesses will create an enormous hardship on these families. They are already living in hardship, since Swansea is serving free lunch and breakfast. Where would they go? What could they afford?</p> <p>Take a harder look at the second alternative. Thanks!</p>	website

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
120	3/31/2009		Schulz	C	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I was recently informed about your development ideas regarding I-70. One of them involves expanding toward the north and removing part of the Swansea neighborhood and Swansea Elementary itself. I would appreciate if you would consider other options. Swansea Elementary is an integral part of the community and not only provides education for students, but provides numerous activities and resources for parents--taking Swansea away, would be like removing the heart of the community. I realize Swansea is a community of mostly low-economic levels. However, there is pride in the community, in families, in receiving a good education. Many of our parents own their first home in this area. Removing those homes would be devastating to this area. You mentioned that very few people showed up for a community meeting--BELIEVE ME, if you had let someone on the Swansea staff know about your meeting, your meeting would have been overflowing with concerned neighbors. Thank you for listening to my concerns, and please consider other options versus removing our homes and school. Thank you</p>	website
Agency Comments						
121	11/21/08	Aurora	Callison	Mac	Comment period extension request to February 28, 2009	e-mail to Tony Stewart
122	12/4/08	Commerce City	Flannery	Gerald	Comment period extension request to March 31, 2008	letter to Chris Horn
123	12/10/08	USACE	Carey	Tim	Technical and editorial comments on Wetlands and Waters of the U.S. Technical Report (see letter).	Letter to Karla Perry
124	12/26/08	PUC	Fischhaber	Pamela	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to refer to Denver Rock Island Railroad consistently - Need to also refer to BNSF railway - PUC applications for changes to existing highway - rail crossings - Revise section 4.4.2 - See letter 	e-mail to Chris Horn and Jim Bemelen
125	1/26/09	RTD	Van Meter	Bill	RTD expects CDOT, in concurrence with the RTD and CDOT Master IGA and in the spirit of cooperation, to choose or adopt a Preferred Alternative that does not interfere with, create additional expense for, or preclude the building of the East Corridor Commuter Rail line between DUS and DIA or the North Metro Commuter Rail line between DUS and SH 7 in the City of Thornton.	letter
126	2/12/09	Colorado Railroad	Ernest	Karsten	<p>Dianna Litvak CDOT Region 6 Historian 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Dear Ms. Litvak,</p> <p>This is in reference to the I-70 East Corridor Draft EIS which I received a few weeks ago. After reading the parts of the report that interest me, I have only a few little corrections. First is on page 3.5-8 which stated that the Union Pacific was in the area in 1867. No the UP was in Julesburg, not Denver. Several pages later, the report is correct. Also the other railroads did not come until the 1880's. The early name of the CB&Q is the Burlington & Missouri River in Nebraska. Also on that page, change Denver Tramway Corporation to Denver Tramway Company. The change from company to corporation was in 1925. On page 3.5-11, there is a mention of the DP roundhouse at 26th Street. I do not recall this being named "the Denver Junction"? I would omit the reference to Denver Junction.</p>	Letter to Dianna Litvak

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
126	2/13/09	Railroad Museum	Forrest	Kenton	<p>The next item is the Fire Clay Lofts (page 3.5-22 and others). This building was built 117 years ago as the Blake Street Powerhouse for the Denver Tramway. See the attached material. If it were to be placed on the register, I know that someone else would do the paper work and not CDOT. However, it would be nice to label the building with the correct name.</p> <p>The last item is more of a personal note. This is in reference to the UPRR Segement on page 3.5-21. Upon reading this paragraph and showing it to many rail fans and historians, the question is "why?" This is a common section of track and right-of-way which is no different than many other sections of railroads in Colorado. The DP is an interesting route and we hope it is never abandoned. If you were to place this section on the register, you would have to place most of Colorado's railroads on the list. Anyway, I question this property eligible. Otherwise, the rest of the report looks ok to me.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kenton Forest</p>	letter to Dianna Litvak
127	3/30/09	Adams County	Pace	Larry	<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation, FHWA-CO-EIS-08-02-D</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: The Adams County Board of Commissioners is providing this letter as our official comments for the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The county cannot support the DEIS as it currently stands due to Alternatives 4 and 6. This is because their direct, indirect and cumulative impacts have not been adequately analyzed.</p> <p>One of the primary purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to disclose the impacts caused by a federal action. One cannot fully disclose the impacts if the study area has been restricted. Proposing the realignment and change-in-access of a mainline facility such as I-70, without expanding the study area to fully analyze the impacts and consider potential mitigation measures, does not meet the intent of NEPA. If Alternatives 4 and 6 are to be considered after the DEIS, the study area must be adequately expanded to analyze the affected environment associated with these alignments and change-in-access. Should you have any questions, please contact Jeanne Shreve with the Adams County Planning and Development Department at 303.453.8800.</p> <p>Sincerely, Larry W. Pace Alice J. Nichol W. R. "Skip" Fischer</p>	letter sent via mail to CDOT
					<p>(Note: On 6/10/10, Councilwoman Montero submitted a request to the project team to withdraw her comment on the I-70 East DEIS - see attachment)</p> <p>For over five years now, I have been working with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the City of Denver and neighborhood leaders to maximize the benefits of rail and highway improvements in the I-70 East Corridor in District 9.</p> <p>A great deal of my energy has been spent on changes to I-70 as it runs through the District 9 neighborhoods of Globeville and Elyria/Swansea. The highway currently runs on a viaduct that is more than 40 years old and is in poor condition. It is a safety hazard and requires millions of dollars in maintenance. This bridge is a prime example of our nation's need to rebuild infrastructure. The status quo cannot be maintained any longer; the highway must be upgraded.</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is impossible to do this type of project without a certain amount of disruption. Inevitably, neighborhoods have to be inconvenienced in a construction project of this magnitude. I have worked tirelessly to</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
128	3/31/09		Montero	Judy	<p>protect the neighborhoods in my district and ensure that the impacts are as small as possible.</p> <p>Based on that objective, with respect to the upgrades to I-70 in my district, I support Alternatives 4 and 6 as outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Both of these Alternatives would divert I-70 north from its current location to about 56th Avenue for a distance of roughly 0.8 miles. I support these alternatives because, of all the feasible options, they impose the least impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> they displace the lowest number of homes they displace lowest number of businesses they eliminate the need to relocate Swansea Elementary School they have the shortest construction times they open up development opportunities for the neighborhood along 46th Avenue <p>Regrettably, these options do have some degree of impact. But impacts are unavoidable in a project of this size in the heart of a major city. The key for me is to ensure that the impact is as small as possible. That is why I support Alternatives 4 and 6. Among the available options, they impose the lowest impact.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6 are the only options remaining from more than 100 scenarios that have been studied over the last five years. All other options were rejected by the CDOT team for various reasons, including cost, safety, environmental impact, and construction duration. One of the rejected alternatives was the idea of running I-70 below grade through District 9 in a tunnel. CDOT ruled it out because it failed on several counts, including cost, security, safety, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>Even though the tunnel idea was rejected several years ago and has not been an active option since then, it remains popular among some residents in District 9. I accept and rely upon the expertise of the transit professionals who have prepared the DEIS and outlined the final four Alternatives. Among the options in the DEIS, I have chosen the one that imposes the least impact on my district.</p>	website
129	3/31/09	National Trust	Cole	Amy	<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: I-70 East DEIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the DEIS for the proposed alterations to I-70 East through Denver. The National Trust for Historic Preservation (National Trust) is concerned about the effect that the alternatives under consideration could have on historic properties in the corridor. The original construction of I-70 was very damaging to a number of historic neighborhoods and separated them from the rest of the city to the south. We are hopeful that this project can repair that damage and not inflict further harm on historic communities.</p> <p>Congress chartered the National Trust in 1949 as a private nonprofit organization to "facilitate public participation" in historic preservation and to further the purposes of federal historic preservation laws. 16 U.S.C. §§ 461, 468.</p> <p>With the support of our 240,000 members around the country, and nearly 4,000 in Colorado, the National Trust works to protect significant historic sites and to advocate historic preservation as a fundamental value in programs and policies at all levels of government. In addition to our headquarters in Washington, D.C., the National Trust operates thirty historic sites open to the public and eight regional and field offices throughout the country. The Mountains/Plains Office, based in Denver, responds to historic preservation issues in Colorado.</p> <p>The National Trust is a consulting party for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We understand that while earlier plans called for use of the NEPA substitution process (allowed in 36 C.F.R. § 800.8(c)) for compliance with Section 106, the processes have now been separated. Therefore, we will reserve additional comments about the Section 106 process until a later date when consultation resumes.</p>	letter sent via Contact Us

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>In general, we believe that Alternatives 4 and 6 (east or west) are the least damaging to historic resources, particularly to the neighborhoods immediately to the north of I-70, including portions of Elyria-Swansea and Northeast Park Hill. The DEIS describes between 11 and 14 historic properties that would be adversely effected as compared to up to 34 adverse effects from the widening alternatives, 1 and 3. In addition, removing the existing viaduct and returning 48th Avenue to a surface street appears to have positive effects on the adjacent historic neighborhoods by restoring connectivity, removing a major visual barrier and reducing noise.</p> <p>Of course, there are still significant effects on historic properties under Alternatives 4 and 6. Of particular note are the effects on the National Western Complex Historic District Livestock Bridge/Flyover and the Stadium Arena.</p> <p>While we expect that these and any other effects would be resolved during the Section 106 process, we also suggest that modifications to the precise alignment of Alternatives 4 and 6 could be made to avoid or minimize the impacts on these and other historic resources and encourage CDOT to investigate possible refinements, should Alternatives 4 or 6 be determined as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of our comments and look forward to continuing our role as a Section 106 consulting party as the process moves ahead.</p> <p>Amy Cole Sr. Program Officer & Regional Attorney</p>	
					<p>Jim, The attached comments represent our Draft Comment list at this point in time. We will be dispatching a letter to you that will cover our complete comment list.</p> <p>Mac Callison Transportation Planning Supervisor City of Aurora 303.739.7356</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 3.3.4 Local System Improvements <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For the suggested improvements to 6th Avenue what are the limits to those improvements? Do they impact Aurora? b. Expand Exhibit 3-13 to show those improvements. 2. The I-70 Corridor Optimization Study covering the portion of I-70 between Picadilly and Monaghan indicated I-70 would be widened to 6 lanes. If so, shouldn't this DEIS also reflect that document for Section 5 from Pena Blvd to Tower Road? At least make note of the other document's recommendation. 	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
130	3/31/09	City of Aurora	Callison	Mac	<p>3. Additional discussion on the collector-distributor streets that would be a part of Sections 4 and 5 is needed. If these are added next to the I-70 corridor impacts to City streets on the south side just east of I-225 need to be identified and mitigated.</p> <p>4. Exhibit 5.2-20 the University of Colorado Hospital is listed as one of Denver's employers. This needs to be restated as an Aurora employment center.</p> <p>5. The economic effects discussion in Section 5.2 does not appear to cover the collector-distributor streets impacts adequately on the local businesses in Sections 4 and 5 of all alternatives.</p> <p>6. Under Section 5.5 it would be helpful to see the Right-of-way Requirements and parcel Effects exhibits further broken down relative to the corridor sections to be able to see the impacts within the Denver and Aurora communities.</p> <p>7. In Section 5.16 the preliminary location for one of the WQ BMP's at the southwesterly intersection of I-70 and Chambers has a current Site Plan with the Planning Department.</p> <p>There is a building currently under construction on a portion of the property. The preliminary location just north of I-70 and east of Airport Blvd is the current location of a regional detention pond with an offline water quality pond for the Gateway development. This will likely need to be expanded to accommodate highway drainage.</p> <p>8. Section 5.19: What size of water and sanitary sewer lines are considered major lines? This needs to be identified.</p> <p>9. Section 5.21: Exhibit 5.21-3 needs to incorporate the Horizon Uptown Project as an approximately 500 plus acre development. The rest of the information could be derived from Mindy Parnes, project manager in the Planning Department. This is an Urban Center type development with a LEED design theme.</p> <p>10. Appendix A – Alternative Maps – Side Streets should be retitled to Arterial Streets in the map legends and local streets depicted with a different symbology.</p> <p>Let me know if you have any questions.</p> <p>Bill</p>	Contact Us e-mail
					<p>Memorandum</p> <p>To: James Bemelen, CDOT From: Steve Cook, Manager, MPO Planning Program, DRCOG Date: March 31, 2009 Re: Comments from DRCOG staff on the I-70 East Draft EIS</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the I-70 East Draft EIS. Our comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. General: Alternatives 4/6 ("Realigned") extend up to I-270, and the overall DEIS gives much less emphasis to processes and analyses of the area around these alternatives (e.g. maps, outreach, technical analyses, traffic impacts) than it does those that remain on the I-70 alignment. The FEIS should take a closer look at impacts and mitigation measures along the Realigned Alternatives, especially if one is strongly considered as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>2. General: Regarding text, table, and figure references to the DRCOG travel demand model, it should be mentioned that the DRCOG model was used as the base, but the EIS team used/ran the model (with adjustments?) to obtain the volumes/data, if such was the case.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
131	3/31/2009	DRCOG	Cook	Steve	<p>3. Page 1.4, Section 1.2: may want to reference that the "most recently adopted" DRCOG 2035 MVRTP at the time of the ROD will be used as the basis.</p> <p>4. Page 1-5: Here and elsewhere, the FEIS should reference the current DRCOG region as including all of 9 counties, and part of a 10th (Weld County).</p> <p>5. Page 1.6: "Vision" also includes improvement at Vasquez Blvd. interchange with I-270.</p> <p>6. Chapter 2: In the beginning of this chapter, it should be mentioned why 2030 is being used as the base future year for upcoming demographic and travel data analysis – because 2030 was the applicable horizon year at the start of the EIS. This will help readers transition from the previous pages that had frequent reference to 2035 (MVRTP).</p> <p>7. Page 3-6: Evaluation of a stand-alone management alternative (e.g. TDM/TSM) is required at some point in the overall process per congestion management requirements in non-attainment areas. DRCOG has always suggested such be included in DEISs in the process of identifying and winnowing down of alternatives. We expect it was probably done, but should be clearly noted.</p> <p>This is required for any project that may increase capacity on the regional roadway system. If it has not been done, then a stand-alone assessment should be prepared. If the management alternative does not to meet the purpose and need, then it should be noted. Note that the FEIS will need to identify appropriate management actions that will accompany the remaining alternatives including the preferred alternative, and the ROD will need to commit to appropriate management strategies.</p> <p>8. Page 3-53: The second paragraph should reference the Fiscally Constrained 2030 RTP as the source for base improvements assumed for implementation. It should also be noted that the 2035 RTP will be the base for the FEIS</p> <p>9. Page 3-37 to 3-50: First set of diagrams for Alt. 4 and Alt. 6 do not depict the possible I-270 alignment. Very brief mention is made on page 3-47, and then it is roughly depicted on page 3-50 without any clear labeling. We would suggest the provision of a clearer explanation and diagram of how the original alternative alignment was refined.</p> <p>10. Page 4-8 to 4-35: There are no analysis results or traffic volume data provided for I-270 northwest of 56th where I-70 would connect in (Alternatives 4 & 6). It seems that this would be an impacted location.</p> <p>11. Page 4-43: Sand Creek Trail should be referenced here, or at some other place in the document such as Page 4-39 or 40 in relation to construction impacts and preservation of the facility.</p> <p>12. Page 5.10-8: Project area is in a Nonattainment area for Ozone (8-hour standard).</p> <p>13. Page 5.21-26: It should be mentioned that air quality pollutant emission results are calculated by the Air Pollution Control Division of the Colorado Department of Health and Environment in conjunction with DRCOG modeling outputs. Exhibit 5.21-16 should note that the pollutant measures are for mobile source emissions only.</p>	Contact Us e-mail
					<p>Mr. James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: I-70 East DEIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the DEIS for the proposed alterations to I-70 East through Denver. Here at Colorado Preservation, Inc. we are concerned about the effect that the alternatives under consideration could have on historic properties in the corridor. The original construction of I-70 was very harmful to a number of historic neighborhoods causing them a visual and emotional separation from the rest of the city to the south. We believe that this project can repair the harm and not mete out further harm on historic communities.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
132	3/31/09	Colorado Preservation Inc.	Daniels	Jane	<p>Colorado Preservation, Inc. was founded in 1984 as a statewide organization dedicated to promoting and advancing historic preservation in the State of Colorado. After our first year we were incorporated as a 501(c) (3) non-profit organization. One of our missions is to help enrich and support all communities in the state, with much of our work as preservation advocates for communities that would otherwise be forgotten. This mission as well as many others has gained us the respect and recognition from many different constituents across the state and nationally.</p> <p>Colorado Preservation, Inc. is a consulting party for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We understand that while earlier plans called for use of the NEPA substitution process (allowed in 36 C.F.R. § 800.8(c)) for compliance with Section 106, the processes have now been separated. Therefore, we will reserve additional comments about the Section 106 process until a later date when consultation resumes.</p> <p>Furthermore, CPI believes that Alternatives 4 and 6 (east or west) are less impactful to historic resources, particularly to the neighborhoods immediately to the north of I-70, including portions of Elyria-Swansea and Northeast Park Hill. The DEIS describes between 11 and 14 historic properties that would be adversely effected as compared to up to 34 adverse effects from the widening alternatives, 1 and 3. In addition, removing the existing viaduct and returning 48th Avenue to a surface street appears to have positive effects on the adjacent historic neighborhoods by restoring connectivity, removing a major visual barrier and reducing noise.</p> <p>Of course, there are still significant effects on historic properties under Alternatives 4 and 6. Of particular note are the effects on the National Western Complex Historic District Livestock Bridge/Flyover and the Stadium Arena.</p> <p>While we expect that these and any other effects would be resolved during the Section 106 process, we also suggest that modifications to the precise alignment of Alternatives 4 and 6 could be made to avoid or minimize the impacts on these and other historic resources and encourage CDOT to investigate possible refinements, should Alternatives 4 or 6 be determined as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of our comments and look forward to continuing our role as a Section 106 consulting party as the process moves ahead.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jane Daniels Project Manager</p>	letter sent via Contact Us
					<p>Project Team note: Katie Johnston, Sarah April, Sean Cumberlege, Professor Michael Harris, and Professor Craig Pease submitted a 36 page letter/report with comments to the DEIS. The Summary of Comments section is included here and the letter is attached for reference. (see attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original implementation of I-70 deeply impacted the make-up, health, and character of the neighboring communities. While the current DEIS acknowledges the past impacts of I-70 on the neighborhoods of Globeville, Swansea and Elyria, it provides no discussion on how realignment of the highway will further impact these neighborhoods. • The current DEIS analysis of highway alternatives is inadequate because it lacks sufficient analysis of social cohesion and health issues that clearly impact neighboring communities. 	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
133	3/31/2009	University of Denver	Harris	Michael	<p>o The DEIS lacks an adequate assessment of neighborhood cohesion issues for each alternative, including the direct and indirect impacts each proposed alternative would have on social cohesion issues in the area.</p> <p>o Additionally, DEIS lacks an adequate analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on air quality, especially as it relates to the health of those living immediately adjacent (< 400 m) to the highway.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> In light of the availability of both data detailing the negative health impacts of DPM, and scientific modeling tools, the I-70 expansion needs to include a quantitative analysis of the public health risks that DPM from this project poses.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The DEIS impacts analysis fails to acknowledge or address the DPM hotspots that are well known to exist around interstate highways. These Hot spots are thus a reasonably foreseeable result of the expanded I-70 highways (and increased traffic). As such, the agency is under a duty to provide the public with information about them, and to fully evaluate them in the DEIS.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Before the EIS is finalized, the agency must quantify the increased incidence of asthma, heart disease and cancer in those who will live, work and recreate immediately adjacent (< 400m) to the various proposed alternatives, as a result of being exposed to elevated levels of air pollutants from vehicles on I-70 East.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The DEIS impacts analysis is insufficient because it fails to adequately take into account the cumulative effects of the proposed highway project</p> <p>• The area is highly populated with children, highly exposed to existing industrial development, and some neighborhoods exist at the confluence of both I-70, I-25, as well as rail-yards.</p> <p>• A more comprehensive assessment of the cumulative health impacts in many of the neighborhoods is clearly warranted to give a better understanding of the health risk each alternative poses to the local communities.</p> <p>o The DEIS is also inadequate because it fails to provide alternatives and/or mitigation measures that would address both the community cohesion concerns and the impact the highway has on public health in the surrounding area. Such mitigation could include, but not be limited to: use of below grade construction (like the I-25 corridor in south Denver); the use of tunnels, parkway type construction; to include open space, greenways, bike and pedestrian paths; increased local road over-passes; and making the structure more aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>o The stated purpose and need of the project is too narrow in scope, as it failed to take into account the needs of the surrounding communities, and resulted in an inadequate alternatives screening process. To fully evaluate the impacts of the I-70 East Project, and to address the impact on the communities of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea, continued planning of the project should be done in coordination with the City of Denver and the affected community-based organizations, and should be done in conjunction with ongoing neighborhood planning efforts.</p> <p>o The Section 4(f) Analysis is insufficient because it fails to justify that there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to using 4(f) land and also failed to identify the least harmful alternatives.</p>	letter submitted via contact us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
134	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 8 1595 Wynkoop Street DENVER, CO 80202-1129 Phone 800-227-8917 http://www.epa.gov/region08</p> <p>MAR 31 2009</p> <p>Ref: EPR-N</p> <p>Karla S. Petty Division Administrator, Colorado Division Federal Highway Administration 12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 180 Lakewood, CO 80228</p> <p>Russell George Colorado Department of Transportation 420 I E. Arkansas Ave. Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: I-70 East Highway Project, Denver CO Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) CEQ# 20080460</p> <p>Dear Ms. Petty and Mr. George: The United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 (EPA) has reviewed the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT's) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the I-70 East highway project. EPA offers these comments in accordance with the Agency's responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. Section 4332(2)(C) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. Section 7609.</p> <p>The project proposes improvements to the I-70 corridor traversing northeast Denver, between I-25 and Tower Road. Four build alternatives are evaluated in addition to the No Action Alternative. They are: Alternative 1 : Existing: add general purpose lanes on the existing I-70 alignment (one in each direction, and in some places, two); Alternative 3: Existing, tolled: Add tolled express lanes on the existing I-70 alignment (one lane in each direction, and in some places, two); Alternative 4, Realigned: Realignment with general purpose lanes (add one lane in each direction, and four new lanes in the realigned portion); and Alternative 6: Realignment with tolled express lanes (add one lane in each direction, four general purpose lanes in some places, or three general purpose lanes and two tolled express lanes in certain places). Each of the alternatives also changes several existing interchanges and adds new interchanges. The No Action Alternative assumes that the viaduct between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard would be replaced. [Note: Alternatives 2 and 5 were eliminated during the screening process.]</p> <p>The DEIS provides a significant amount of analysis on a myriad of important concerns. The section on social and economic conditions is one of the most complete analyses on this topic we have reviewed in this EPA Region. The Environmental Justice section similarly contains significant analysis. EPA' s comments focus on air quality impacts and environmental justice concerns, with some minor comments on wetlands/waters of the U.S., water quality, energy and greenhouse gas emissions. Enclosed are our detailed comments in these areas. (see attachment)</p> <p>Our major concern with this project is the potential air quality impact on the minority and low-income populations this project affects. The DEIS identifies these populations as disproportionately impacted by this project, but dismisses the air quality issues as a significant impact. Emissions of particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM10) will increase in the project area by approximately 50% by 2030 for each build alternative.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>In addition, while regional emissions of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) will decrease overall by 55-65% due to federal vehicle and fuel regulations, EPA remains concerned that shifting the roadway closer to existing residents (as called for in Alternatives 1 and 3), or exposure to residents currently not near the roadway (Alternatives 4 and 6) will increase localized MSAT exposure significantly. This concern is based on the fact that near-roadway concentrations of MSATs can be several times higher than regional concentrations. EPA has concerns with the PM10 and MSAT impacts to these communities, and with many of the OEIS' conclusions regarding the unreliability of modeling to determine MSAT exposure. EPA recommends additional mitigation for the PM10 impacts, dispersion modeling and possible additional mitigation for MSAT impacts, and some language suggestions for the modeling conclusions, in our detailed comments, enclosed.</p> <p>Rating Based on EPA's review, and in accordance with our policies and procedures for reviews under NEPA and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, EPA has rated the alternatives analyzed in this DEIS as EC-2 (Environmental Concerns - Insufficient Information). The Environmental Concerns rating indicates that the EPA review identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect human health or the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts. The "2" rating indicates that the DEIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. In this case, the air quality impacts of this project on a minority and low-income population identified as disproportionately impacted, is insufficiently analyzed. The identified additional information should be included in the Final EIS. An explanation of the rating criteria is enclosed.</p> <p>EPA wishes to thank FHWA and CDOT for the many meetings in the early years of this project. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIS and look forward to working with you to resolve the issues raised in our detailed comments. If you have any questions on our comments, please contact me at 303 312-6004 or Deborah Lebow Aal at 303 312-6223.</p> <p>Sincerely, Larry Svoboda Director, NEPA Program Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation</p>	
					<p>I-70 East Highway Project DEIS Denver, CO EPA Detailed Comments</p> <p>Air Quality Summary: Our major concern with this project is the potential air quality impact on the minority and low-income populations this project affects. The OEIS identifies these populations as disproportionately impacted by this project but dismisses the air quality issues as a significant impact. Emissions of particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM10) will increase in the project area by approximately 50% by 2030 for each build alternative. While regional emissions of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) will decrease overall by 55-65% due to federal vehicle and fuel regulations, EPA remains concerned that shifting the roadway closer to residents (as called for in Alternatives 1 and 3), or exposure to residents currently not near the roadway (Alternatives 4 and 6) will increase localized MSAT exposure significantly. This concern is based on the fact that near-roadway concentrations of MSATs can be several times higher than regional concentrations.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
135	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is estimated in the DEIS to be in the range of 6,565,300 miles per day for the No Action Alternative in year 2010 to over 10,000,000 for any of the build alternatives in 2030 (see DEIS p. 5.10-19), which is a very significant amount of traffic, and is relevant to the significance of the PM10 and MSAT impacts. EPA has concerns with PM10 and MSAT impacts to the affected communities, and with many of the DEIS' conclusions regarding the unreliability of modeling to determine MSAT exposure. EPA recommends additional mitigation for the PM10 impacts, dispersion modeling and possible additional mitigation for MSAT impacts, and some language suggestions for the modeling conclusions, below.</p> <p>Particulate Matter (PM) impacts: The DEIS predicts that PM10 emissions are expected to jump 50 percent by 2030 for all build alternatives (See DEIS pp. 5.10-1, 5.10-22). The DEIS states that since emissions in the study area would not exceed the NAAQS (National Ambient Air Quality Standards), there is no mitigation necessary.</p> <p>However, the document includes some mitigation for air emissions during construction and some during operation. These measures should be augmented to include the construction engine exhaust potential mitigation measures listed in section 8.1 of the DEIS's Air Quality Technical Report (AQTR). These mitigation measures should be listed in the FEIS and included in the Record of Decision (ROD). EPA strongly recommends that CDOT's contracts for construction contain requirements for PM10 mitigation measures.</p> <p>The additional mitigation measures listed in section 8.1 of the AQTR are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prohibit unnecessary idling of construction equipment; - Require use of low-sulfur fuel; - Locate diesel engines and motors as far away as possible from residential areas; - Locate staging areas as far away as possible from residential uses; and - Require heavy construction equipment to use the cleanest available engines or be retrofitted with diesel particulate control technology. <p>We also recommend inclusion of other engine exhaust mitigation measures contained in EPA's December 30, 2003 letter of scoping comments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use alternatives to diesel engines and/or diesel fuels such as: biodiesel, LNG or CNG, fuel cells, and electric engines; - For winter time construction, install engine pre-heater devices to eliminate unnecessary idling; - Prohibit tampering with equipment to increase horsepower or to defeat emission control devices effectiveness; - Require construction vehicle engines to be properly tuned and maintained; and - Use construction vehicles and equipment with the minimum practical engine size for the intended job. <p>EPA notes that PM2.5 trends were not evaluated in the DEIS. EPA recommends that any known information on PM2.5 trends be added to the FEIS.</p> <p>Ozone Nonattainment (DEIS p. 5.10-2): The language in this section should be updated to reflect that the nonattainment designation was a result of a violation of the federal 1997 8-hour 0.080 ppm ozone standard and was effective on November 20, 2007. We note that a detailed plan to reduce ozone has been developed and should be referenced in the FEIS.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>The resulting attainment plan was approved by the State on December 12, 2008, and is expected to be submitted to EPA not later than July 1, 2009. The plan will require further reductions of ozone levels beyond what was previously required. This change should also be made on p. 5.10-26 of the DEIS. Additional detailed Air Quality comments are included at the end of this enclosure.</p> <p>Mobile Source Air Toxics Air toxics are defined as pollutants in the air that are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects, such as respiratory, neurological, reproductive, and developmental effects. MSATs are usually the largest source of air toxics of concern in urban areas. Emissions from mobile sources typically occur near the ground and are not particularly buoyant. Therefore, the largest impacts of these emissions tend to occur at receptors close to the source. A large number of studies have examined the association between living near major roads and different adverse health endpoints. Recent modeling and monitoring studies have confirmed that air toxics emissions from mobile sources remain drivers of overall air toxics risks.</p> <p>See, for example, South Coast Air Quality Management District's Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study III (or the MATES III study, www.agmd.gov/prdas/matesIII/matesIII.html). For additional information on MSATs, please see EPA's MSAT website, www.epa.gov/otag/toxics.htm. The likelihood of significant MSAT impacts and whether MSATs should be analyzed in an EIS should be based on the magnitude of the project, the proximity of sensitive receptors, and how alternatives change these impacts. Shifting an alignment with high VMT closer to the affected population should merit more analysis than an emissions inventory (see above in Summary for VMT estimates). EPA recommends that dispersion modeling of the most significant MSATs (e.g., the six included in the DEIS) should be performed. While we are pleased to see a MSAT emissions inventory comparing alternatives, the results of dispersion modeling for the most significant MSATs would disclose important information on whether the communities affected by this project, which the DEIS identifies as low-income and minority populations disproportionately impacted by this project, are impacted by MSATs.</p> <p>The FEIS could then make note of changes in predicted MSAT ambient concentrations at particular locations, to provide the most appropriate mitigation measures. Our primary concerns with the MSAT analysis in this DEIS are that the DEIS contains no dispersion modeling for the MSATs of concern, and may not contain mitigation sufficient to address community impacts. The DEIS states that emissions for the six MSATs addressed will be decreasing and no mitigation is needed (DEIS p. 5.10-27). While it is true that overall MSATs will be decreasing due to implementation of regulations controlling emissions from mobile sources, the DEIS also shows that MSAT emissions from all the build alternatives are slightly higher than for the No Build Alternative. More importantly, because near roadway concentrations of MSATs can be several times higher than regional concentrations, shifting the roadway closer to residents can increase MSAT exposure significantly. EPA recommends that dispersion modeling be performed to assess potential impacts and any additional mitigation be outlined in the FEIS and included in the ROD.</p> <p>EPA's additional concern with the MSAT section is that it contains concepts and language from FHWA's February 2006 Interim Guidance on MSATs, with which EPA has consistently disagreed. We have arranged our comments to follow the DEIS section by section, as follows:</p>	
136	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Mobile Source Air Toxics, General (DEIS pp. 5.10-8 through 5.10-9)</p> <p>The DEIS states that because of the significant reduction in MSATs that will occur because of EPA's 2001 regulations controlling emissions of hazardous air pollutants from mobile sources, "...EPA concluded that no further motor vehicle emissions standards or fuel standards were necessary to further control MSATs." (DEIS p. 5.10-9) This is a misleading statement. This statement was only relevant to national emissions controls at the time of the 2001 rulemaking. The regulatory impact analysis in support of the rule clearly outlined the remaining concerns from near roadway impacts. EPA suggests that this language be removed.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
137	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Unavailable Information for Project-Specific MSAT Analysis (DEIS pp. 5.10-9 through 5.10-14)</p> <p>The DEIS states that "... the lack of a national consensus on an acceptable level of risk and other air quality criteria assumed to protect the public health and welfare, as well as the reliability of available technical tools do not enable us to predict with confidence the project-specific health impacts of the emission changes associated with the alternatives evaluated in this EIS ...Due to these limitations, the following discussion is included in accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR section 1502.22(b)) regarding incomplete or unavailable information" (DEIS p. 5.10-9). The DEIS goes on to discuss technical shortcomings or uncertain science that prevents a more complete determination of the MSAT health impacts for the three steps necessary to get to a health risk assessment: emission inventories, dispersion modeling, and human health risk analysis. EPA disagrees with the conclusions reached in this section of the DEIS. There is a growing body of information regarding air toxics and their inherent health risks.</p> <p>While we may agree that a health risk assessment is not necessary in most NEPA analyses, there are adequate scientific bases for the risks and modeling tools for conducting emissions inventories, dispersion modeling, and human health risk analyses, which have been successfully conducted.</p> <p>The discussion on pages 5.10-12 - 5.10-13 is not relevant to using MOBILE 6.2 as a tool to predict differences in MSAT emissions for alternatives. An inventory of emissions is a very useful tool in a DEIS, and can be based on the MOBILE 6.2 model results.</p> <p>The DEIS claims that the models used by EPA are not adequate to accurately predict levels of MSATs for highway projects. The DEIS also states that "shortcomings in current techniques for exposure assessment and risk analysis preclude the ability to reach meaningful conclusions about project-specific health impacts." (DEIS p. 5.10-13). While there are of course areas of uncertainty with any model, EPA believes that there are analytical tools available that yield credible and meaningful information for the decision-making process.</p> <p>EPA has been studying toxics from all kinds of sources, as they are emitted to air, water, and land for over thirty years. EPA has significant experience in interpreting the state of science, including the uncertainties, and making regulatory decisions about toxics. In addition, the Superfund program has a long history of communicating with communities about risk and the impacts of clean-up options on risk and human health. Although we recognize that these issues are new to the transportation community, EPA's experience in these areas informs our perspective about what is possible and useful.</p> <p>EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ) has developed Modeling Ambient Air Toxics from Transportation Projects, which is a technical description of air toxics analysis tools and methods for highway projects. We recommend using this document in the future for these analyses.</p> <p>In summary, the discussion in the DEIS is directed solely to why conducting health assessments of MSAT impacts from transportation projects does not make sense, and it ignores and undermines the fact that emissions inventory information and dispersion modeling can be done, is credibly done often using EPA-approved models, and can provide worthwhile information. The focus in this document on information that is unavailable or incomplete inappropriately takes the place of information that should be included to disclose the potentially significant adverse impacts from MSATs from this project.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn
					<p>Summary of Existing Credible Scientific Evidence Relevant to Evaluating MSATs (DEIS p.p. 5.10-14 through 5.10-16)</p> <p>The DEIS quotes toxicity information for the six priority MSATs taken from EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) database. The purpose of quoting the weight of evidence sections from IRIS for the priority MSATs is unclear. The section is incomplete because it does not include the numerical estimates of toxicity for the cancer or non-cancer endpoints (Inhalation Unit Risk and Reference Concentration) for these chemicals and does not include information on other MSATs. Information on Inhalation Unit Risks and Reference Concentrations can be found in the tables at http://epa.gov/ttn/atw/toxsource/summary.html. EPA recommends deleting this information or providing clarification.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
138	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>The DEIS references the technical report conducted on North Denver by Gregg Thomas and Debra Bain (2007), which included a portion of the project area. The Thomas et al. report, entitled "Going One Step Beyond: A Neighborhood Scale Air Toxics Assessment in North Denver (The Good Neighbor Project)," evaluated the influence of major roadways on ambient air toxics concentrations in Metropolitan Denver. The assessment included modeling GIS-based data from COOT, Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to predict concentrations of approximately 70 air toxics. The intent of The Good Neighbor Project was to explicitly assign onroad MSAT emissions to actual sections of roads. The results of this report indicate that small-scale, highly detailed air toxics assessments are cost-effective and can generate realistic data that match conceptual models. This report, and the rest of this paragraph (DEIS p. 5.10-16) contradict much of what has been stated in the DEIS on MSATs.</p> <p>A project-specific micro-scale monitoring study can be performed to accurately assess impacts of MSATs from nearby roadways, and in fact such studies have been completed for several EISs. The results from the Good Neighbor Project should be accurately reported in the FEIS. The City and County of Denver should be contacted for more information from the study.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn
139	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Project Level MSAT Discussion (DE1Sp. 5.10-17)</p> <p>As stated earlier, EPA believes that, contrary to the statement made on page 5.10-17, reliable methods do exist to assess the health impacts of MSAT emissions under the project. In fact, several transportation projects have included health risk assessments in the DEIS (see, e.g., Port of Los Angeles China Basin Shipping, Port of Long Beach Middle Harbor, Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway). All three of these documents included a human health risk assessment done for on-road mobile sources. This should not imply that EPA believes a risk assessment should be done for this project, rather, that they can be done and are being done. For this project, EPA believes that already-existing information from the Good Neighbor Project described above, as well as dispersion modeling, should be included in the FEIS.</p> <p>When the highway is widened and moved closer to residences and other critical receptors, the localized concentrations of MSATs will likely be higher for the build alternatives than existing conditions or the no action alternative. While over time regional concentrations of MSATs will decrease due to federal vehicle and fuel regulations, this does not preclude the possibility of localized increases related to this project. The magnitude of this increase should have been more fully analyzed in the DEIS. While there are acknowledged uncertainties in both the local scale emissions model (MOBILE 6.2) and the available roadway dispersion models (CAL3QHC and HYROAD), these tools can provide excellent relevant information on potential impacts. The models' ability to predict relative changes in MSAT concentrations between the build and No Build Alternatives would be less affected by these uncertainties and could provide information to the public on the impact of the project.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn
140	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Environmental Consequences</p> <p>PM10 Hot Spot Analysis: The DEIS predicts increases in PM10 emissions (see DEIS page 5.10-24). As stated above, mitigation should be more specific and geared towards significantly reducing PM10 emissions (see above suggestions), which will consequently reduce MSAT emissions as well.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn
141	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Mobile Source Air Toxics (DEIS pp 5.10-24 - 5.10-26): EPA commends FHWA and CDOT for including the emissions inventory information on MSATs for each alternative in the DEIS. As explained, the DEIS shows a significant decrease in MSATs from 1990 through 2030 for all six MSATs addressed, due to EPA's national emission control programs for vehicles. It also shows that there is a slight increase of emissions from the No Action Alternative as compared to any of the build alternatives, and will potentially be closer to sensitive receptors. EPA believes that more specific mitigation for this impact, particularly for sensitive receptors near the highway, may be appropriate, once dispersion modeling is performed.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
142	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>As stated above in several sections, EPA is suggesting additional mitigation for both PM10 impacts and potentially for MSAT impacts. For MSATs, many of the suggested mitigation measures that will reduce PM10 will also reduce MSAT exposure. These are mostly geared to construction air quality impacts. There may also be opportunities to be more creative with mitigation measures. The affected communities should be consulted, and EPA is available to assist communities in the identification of mitigation measures to reduce impacts. As an example, the measures suggested in the Healthy Air for North Denver (HAND) final report (December 23, 2008) could be used to offset impacts in the community from the highway.</p> <p>Monitoring for PM10, included as a mitigation measure on p. 5.10-27 of the DEIS, could provide a valuable response mechanism regarding direct PM10 emissions on the local, affected community.</p> <p>Monitoring may also be an appropriate mitigation measure for MSATs. EPA suggests that the FEIS provide an outline of a monitoring plan such that EPA, other Agencies, and the affected community could understand how the monitoring will be performed, identify action levels for the monitored data, and how the data will be shared with the appropriate Agencies and the community.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn
143	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Executive Order 12898 directs Federal Agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, "disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations" (E.O. 12898, 59 Fed. Reg. at 7630, section 1-101). The DEIS indicates that impacts of this project on minority and low-income populations will be disproportionately high and adverse compared to the general population or a comparison group. The disproportionate impacts identified in the DEIS are mostly the displacement of homes and businesses, and noise impacts. In addition to these impacts, EPA believes that the potential air quality impacts of moving the highway closer to affected receptors may be a disproportionate impact. The Air Quality section above describes both the PM10 and MSAT impacts as needing further consideration. Mitigation measures to reduce these impacts should be addressed in the FEIS and ROD.</p> <p>CDOT and FHWA did an excellent job in communicating with the impacted communities along the existing 1-70 corridor during the early years of this study. In fact, the DEIS states that Alternatives 4 and 6, the realignment alternatives, grew out of the concerns the communities expressed in meetings with CDOT and FHWA. EPA commends the lead agencies for listening to these concerns, and adding build alternatives to address the concerns. It appears that the communities most involved in the project prefer the selection of one of the realignment alternatives. If Alternatives 1 or 3 (not realignment alternatives) are selected, it is not clear that the newly affected communities have had an opportunity to provide input on the impacts and mitigation. The FEIS and ROD should analyze and compare the relative disproportionate impacts to the different affected communities of one alternative versus another.</p> <p>The primary disproportionate impacts identified in the DEIS are the displacement of homes and businesses, and noise impacts. EPA recommends adding to these impacts the air quality impacts of moving a highway closer to affected receptors. The Air Quality section above describes both the PM10 and MSAT impacts EPA believes need to be further considered as potentially disproportionate impacts.</p> <p>The Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance entitled, Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act (www.whitehouse.gov/CEQ/December10,1997) states that "When an Agency has identified a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on low-income populations, minority populations, or Indian Tribes from either the proposed action or alternatives, the distribution as well as the magnitude of the disproportionate impacts in these communities should be a factor in determining the environmentally-preferable alternative." (CEQ Guidance p. 15).</p> <p>Consistent with this guidance, EPA recommends, that CDOT and FHWA look more closely at the potential adverse air quality impacts on the low-income and minority populations that may be disproportionately impacted by the project. We expect that when CDOT and FHWA identify their environmentally-preferable alternative these air quality impacts will be taken into account. In addition, EPA believes that the mitigation to reduce or avoid disproportionate impacts should be discussed in the FEIS and included in the ROD.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					The DEIS states that " During the public review and comment period for the DEIS, minority and low-income communities (as well as other members of the public) will have the opportunity to review these mitigations and propose other mitigations to reduce impacts. During the development of the FEIS, additional outreach will be conducted to further develop mitigation measures for environmental justice and the community, including meetings with the Environmental Justice Compliance Committee and working groups." (DEIS p. 5.3-35). EPA is available to participate in assisting the community with the identification of mitigation measures to reduce impacts on the affected communities. For further coordination on EPA involvement with the communities on these issues, please contact Tami Thomas-Burton at 303 312-6581.	
144	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	Wetlands The EIS should include an analysis of the potential effects to wetlands along drainages, such as Sand Creek, due to the increased duration of flood flows due to the project. Although the Best Management Practices included in the DEIS include detention ponds to limit runoff to the current flood now amounts, these ponds also increase the duration of the flood flows, which can potentially lead to increased erosion. The wetland and riparian areas along the drainages should be monitored to ensure that any indirect impacts due to the increased runoff from this project is mitigated as soon as possible.	letter sent via email to C. Horn
145	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	Water Quality The DEIS shows an overall increase in pollutant runoff ranging from 11% to 74%. It is not readily discernible how the Driscoll model used in the DEIS identifies the necessary locations for water quality ponds, nor is it easy to discern whether water quality standards will be exceeded. To remedy this, the FEIS should explain: •How water quality ponds are located, designed and maintained to treat the Water Quality Capture Volume as defined by Urban Drainage and Flood Control District; and •How the Driscoll model was used to compare increased loading of copper, lead, and zinc relative to water quality standards to ensure that no discharges would cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards.	letter sent via email to C. Horn
146	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	Energy Consumption Section 5. 11 of the DEIS includes estimates of energy consumption for this project, arranged by alternative. It does not contain any specific commitments to reducing energy consumption, or promoting energy efficiency although it does include a reference to CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Guide, and includes language to work with designers, contractors, and suppliers to implement, where appropriate, energy conservation measures. This section should identify specific requirements to address energy efficiency for the construction of this project.	letter sent via email to C. Horn
147	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	Greenhouse Gas Emissions EPA is pleased to see the discussion of CDOT's commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Governors Climate Action Plan. Exhibit 5.21-17 (DEIS p. 5.21-28) indicates that CO2 emissions from highways will increase from 2005 to 2035. It is unclear whether this estimate takes into account CDOT's emission reduction measures, and if it does, EPA is concerned that CO2 emissions are still increasing. We would assume that the Governor's plan expects that mitigation measures implemented for this project would result in a decrease of CO2 emissions to reach Colorado's Climate Action Plan's goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 20% below 2005 levels by 2020 (and 80% below by 2050). EPA recommends that the FEIS contain additional mitigation measures to address the CO2 increases identified in the DEIS.	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<p>Additional Technical Air Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-1, EPA recommends that the sentence which states: "...emissions in 2030 are projected to be modestly higher (less than ten percent) for all build alternatives..." be modified. In view of the emissions data presented in Exhibit 5.10-9 on page 5.10-21, it would benefit the public to know that emissions are projected to be higher in all the analysis years (2010, 2020, and 2030) for all pollutants evaluated when compared to the no-action alternative. • DEIS p. 5.10-2, second full paragraph, fourth sentence should be modified to state "For this to happen the state must develop a maintenance plan that demonstrates maintenance of the standard for an initial period of at least ten years after redesignation to attainment by EPA (ref. CAA section 175A(a)). EPA must then approve the redesignation request to attainment and the maintenance plan. Once this happens, the area's designation is then changed to attainment/maintenance. <p>Eight years after the area is redesignated to attainment/maintenance, the area must submit for EPA's approval a revised maintenance plan that demonstrates maintenance for a subsequent ten-year maintenance period (ref. CAA section 175A(b))." If the above clarification is made, the last sentence in this paragraph should be deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-2: References are made to the "...8-hour ozone standard...", which should be clarified to only be describing the 1997 8-hour (0.08 ppm) standard (and not the 2008 revised 8-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm.) • DEIS p. 5.10-3, The sentence which discusses "...strong temperature inversions during the colder months" should be expanded to also discuss the stagnant air inversions that occur in the summer months which have lead to violations of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the metro-Denver/NFR area 's current nonattainment designation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-4, Exhibit 5.10-1: EPA revised the lead (Pb) standard to 0.15 µg/m3 which is measured over a rolling 3-month average. (ref. 73 rR 66964, November 12, 2008, effective January 12, 2009.) The exhibit should be changes to show that the lead primary and secondary standards arc the same. • DEIS p. 5.10-6, second paragraph: It would be more valuable to have the discussion of monitoring data for the current National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) that are relevant to the metro-Denver area and the project (i.e., 24-hour PM25 standard of 35 µg/m3 and the B-hour ozone standards of 0.075 ppm and 0.080 ppm.) • DEIS p. 5.10-6, Exhibit 5.10-3: Several comments - the averaging times shown for the 8-hour ozone standard and the 1-hour ozone standard should be reversed (8-hour ozone standard is the 4th max. value and the 1-hour ozone standard is the 1st max. value); under the heading of "Existing NAAQS Standard" the 8-hour ozone NAAQS is now 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008); <p>the 24-hour PM2.5 value for 2001 (68.0) is highlighted; however, exeedanees for the 24-hour 35 µg/m3 NAAQS are shown for 2000, 2002,2004,2005, and 2006, and finally , State-certified ambient air quality data are available for 2007 and should be presented in the table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-7, Exhibit 5.10-3: Several comments - the averaging times shown for the 8-hour ozone standard and the 1-hour ozone standard should be reversed (8-hour ozone standard is the 4th max. value and the 1-hour ozone standard is the 1st max. value); under the heading of "Existing NAAQS Standard" the 8-hour ozone NAAQS is now 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008); the exeedance of the B-hour ozone NAAQS in 2006 should also b highlighted; the 24-hour PM2.5 value for 2001 and 2006 show exeedances for the 24-hour 35 µg/m3 NAAQS, and finally , State-certified ambient air quality data are available for 2007 and should be presented in the table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-8: At this point in time, the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) is required to demonstrate conformity for the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) in the attainment/maintenance plans for CO, PM10, NOx associated with PM10, the VOC component of the 1-hour ozone maintenance plan, and the NOx component of the 1-hour maintenance plan (ref. Table 4 on page 29 of the "2008 Amendment Cycle 2 DRCOG Conformity Determination" as adopted by DRCOG on January 21, 2009.) • DEIS p. 5.10-8, paragraph entitled "Criteria Pollutants", the sentence which states that "The mobile source emission factors for PM10 and S02 were taken from Table 3.4-1 Summary of VMT..." should include a brief explanation or footnote as to why the factors from EPA's MOBILE6.2 model and AP-42 section 13.2 were not used. 	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-20: The sentence which states that "Exhibit 5.10-9 and Exhibit 5.10-10 show the annual criteria pollutant emissions associated with the different alternatives" should be clarified. When reviewing Exhibit 5.10-10 on page 5.10-22 it is unclear what data are represented as only one graph appears and does not have a title as to the no-action or a particulate alternative. Also, the CO line in Exhibit 5.10-10 appears to be in error as for the no-action or any of the alternatives, do the CO emissions exceed 35,000 tons per year (ref. data in Exhibit 5.10-9)? • DEIS p. 5.10-21, Exhibit 5.10-9: The note at the bottom of the table states that "PM10 emissions include PM, NOx, and SO2 from exhaust and road dust and sanding emissions." This appears inconsistent with the table above where NOx, SO2, and PM10 are specifically broken out. • DEIS p. 5.10-21, Exhibit 5.10-9: On page 5.10-15 potential hazards and toxicology of particular MSATs are presented as extracted from EPA's Integrated Risk Information System. Diesel exhaust appears as "... likely to be carcinogenic to humans by inhalation from environmental exposures. <p>Diesel exhaust as reviewed in this document is the combination of DPM and diesel exhaust gases." Based on this and other statements in the Air Quality section, a discussion should be provided regarding PM2.5 and PM2.5 emissions should be provided, in addition to the emission figure s included in Exhibit 5.10-9, for all the analysis year (2001, 2010, 2020, and 2030.) As applicable for the other criteria pollutants, we note that EPA's MOBILE6.2 can calculate PM2.5 emissions (see page 55 of the "User's Guide to MOBILE6.1 and MOBILE6.2"; EPA420-R-03-010, August, 2003.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-22: the sentence which indicates that the project should have minimal effect on O3 levels should be changed to "...indicates that the project should have minimal additional effects on O3 levels." • DEIS p. 5.10-23: It is indicated that a CO Hot-spot analysis is not required for the No Action Alternative. EPA recommends adding a sentence explaining why the No Action Alternative is not being evaluated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS p. 5.10-26, Exhibit 5.10-14: This Exhibit is labeled "Annual Mobile Source Air Toxics Emissions." This does not appear to be correct as these are criteria pollutant emissions data. • DEIS p. 5.2 1-25: The statement that "No violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards for pollutants have been recorded in the Denver metropolitan area since 1995" is incorrect for all six criteria pollutants and contradicts the sentence that follows, which discusses the nonattainment designation for metropolitan Denver with respect to the 8-hour 0.080 ppm NAAQS. This statement should be revised. 	
148					<p><u>Air Quality Technical Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 3, paragraph entitled "Eight-Hour Ozone and Particulate Matter PM2.5 NAAQS", second sentence which states: "... and tightening the existing eight hour O3 standard." For clarity, EPA recommends this section elaborate on the prior 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS of 0.080 ppm and the new 8-hour ozone AAQS of 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008, effective May 27, 2008.) • Pg. 4, first paragraph under "Existing Conditions": This paragraph should be revised to reflect the following redesignation to attainment Federal process beginning with the fifth sentence: "For this to happen the state must develop a maintenance plan that demonstrates maintenance of the standard for an initial period of at least ten years after redesignation to attainment by EPA (ref. CAA section 175A(a)). EPA must then approve the redesignation request to attainment and the maintenance plan. Once this happens, the area's designation is then changed to attainment/maintenance. <p>Also, eight years after the area is redesignated to attainment/maintenance, the area must submit for EPA's approval a revised maintenance plan that demonstrates maintenance for a subsequent ten-year maintenance period (ref. CAA section 175A(b))." Based on the above clarification, the last sentence in this paragraph should be deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 4, second paragraph under "Existing Conditions", third sentence should be revised to read as: "Because of violations of the 1997 8-hour ozone standard, based on air quality data from 2001, 2002, and 2003, EPA designated the metro-Denver area as nonattainment in April, 2004, but deferred the effective date as the State and regional air quality agencies in metro- Denver had worked to develop a plan to address the 8-hour ozone NAAQS nonattainment issue." 	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
	3/31/2009	EPA	Svoboda	Larry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 4, second paragraph under "Existing Conditions", second last sentence: This should be revised to reflect that a detailed plan to reduce ozone has been developed by the Colorado Air Pollution Control Division, along with the Regional Air Quality Council, Denver Regional Council of Governments, and the North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization. The resulting attainment plan was submitted by the Regional Air Quality Council to the Colorado Air Quality Control Commission and was approved on December 12, 2008, with legislative review expected in early 2009, and as per Court settlement, submitted to EPA by not later than July 1, 2009. The plan will require further reductions on ozone levels beyond what was previously required. • Pg. 4, second paragraph under "Existing Conditions", last sentence: For the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the metro-Denver area is nonattainment as of November 20, 2007. The metro-Denver area is attainment/maintenance for the prior 1-hour ozone NAAQS as of October 11, 2001. (This is relevant as currently, DRCOG must still demonstrate conformity to the VOC and NOx MVEBs in the maintenance plan.) • Pg. 4, last paragraph on the page: This should be expanded to also discuss the stagnant air inversions that occur in the summer months which have lead to violations of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the metro-Denver/NFR area's current nonattainment designation. • Pg. 6, Table 1: EPA revised the lead (Pb) standard to 0.15 µg/m3, which is measured over a rolling 3-month average. (ref. 73 FR 66964, November 12, 2008, effective January 12, 2009.) The lead primary and secondary standards are the same. EPA also revised the 8-hour ozone standard to 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008.) We note though that the prior 8-hour 0.08 ppm NAAQS is still applicable to metro-Denver as the area is designated as nonattainment for that standard. • Pg. 8, last paragraph, last sentence: To clarify, at this point in time, the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) is required to demonstrate conformity for the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) in the attainment/maintenance plans for CO, PM10, NOx associated with PM10, the VOC component of the 1-hour ozone maintenance plan, and the NOx component of the 1-hour maintenance plan (ref. Table 4 on page 29 of the "2008 Amendment Cycle 2 DRCOG Conformity Determination" as adopted by DRCOG on January 21, 2009.) • Pg. 9, Table 3: The averaging times shown for the 8-hour ozone standard and the 1-hour ozone standard should be reversed (8-hour ozone standard is the 4th max. value and the 1-hour ozone standard is the 1st max. value); under the heading of "Existing NAAQS Standard" the 8-hour ozone NAAQS is now 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008); the 24-hour PM2.5 value for 2001 (68.0) is highlighted; however, exceedances for the 24-hour 35 µg/m3 NAAQS are shown for 2000, 2002, 2004, 2005, and 2006, and finally, State-certified ambient air quality data are available for 2007 and should be presented in the table. • Pg. 10, Table 3: The averaging times shown for the 8-hour ozone standard and the 1-hour ozone standard should be reversed (8-hour ozone standard is the 4th max. value and the 1-hour ozone standard is the 1st max. value); under the heading of "Existing NAAQS Standard" the 8-hour ozone NAAQS is now 0.075 ppm (ref. 73 FR 16436, March 27, 2008); the exceedance of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in 2006 should also be highlighted; the 24-hour PM2.5 value for 2001 and 2006 show exceedances for the 24-hour 35 µg/m3 NAAQS, and finally, State-certified ambient air quality data are available for 2007 and should be presented in the table. • Pg. 10, Section 5.2.2 "Mobile Sources Air Toxics": Please refer to our comments regarding MSATs, above. • Pg. 24, section 7.1.1 "Criteria Pollutants", third paragraph: "The mobile source emission factors for PM10 and SO2 were taken from Table 3.4-1 Summary of VMT..."; this statement should include and brief explanation or footnote as to why the factors from EPA's MOBILE6.2 model and AP-42 section 13.2 were not used. 	letter sent via email to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>• Pg. 29, Figure 9: The CO line in Figure 9 appears to be in error as for the no-action alternative, none of the analysis years (2001 to 2030) exceed 35,000 tons per year of CO.</p> <p>• Pg. 45, fourth bullet, paragraph which states: "PM2.5 levels, which have been in compliance with the standards to date, should be watch closely ... the CAMP monitoring Station would have exceeded the standard in 2000, 2001,2002, 2004 and 2005." We note on page 18 potential hazards and toxicology of particular MSATs are presented as extracted from EPA' s Integrated Risk Information System. Diesel exhaust appears as "...likely to be carcinogenic to humans by inhalation from environmental exposures. Diesel exhaust as reviewed in this document i the combination of DPM and diesel exhaust gases." Based on this and other statements in the Air Quality Technical Report, it would be appropriate that a discussion should be provided regarding PM2.5 and that PM2.5 emissions should be provided, in addition to the emission figures for all the analysis years (200 1,20 10,2020, and 2030.)</p> <p>As applicable for the other criteria pollutants, we note that EPA's MOBILE6.2 can calculate PM2.5 emissions (see page 55 of the "User's Guide to MOBILE6.1 and MOBILE6.2"; EPA420-R-03-010, August, 2003.)</p> <p>• Pg. 48, fifth bullet at top of page which states: "Monitoring for PM10, which will allow for the real-time modification or implementation of various dust control measures." This type of potential mitigation measure will provide a valuable response mechanism regarding direct PM10 emissions on the local, affected community. Therefore, it would be appropriate to provide an outline of the monitoring plan such that EPA, other Agencies, and the affected community understand for example; how the monitoring will be performed, identify action levels for the monitored data, and how the data will be shared with the appropriate Agencies and the community.</p> <p>• Pg. 48, under the heading "Other potential mitigation strategies designed to reduce engine exhaust emissions during construction," we suggest inserting other potential engine exhaust mitigation measures contained in our December 30, 2003 letter of scoping comments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use alternatives to diesel engines and/or diesel fuels such as: biodiesel, LNG or CNG, fuel cells, and electric engines. - For winter time construction; install engine pre-heater devices to eliminate unnecessary idling. - Prohibit tampering with equipment to increase horsepower or to defeat emission control devices effectiveness. - Require construction vehicle engines to properly tuned and maintained. - Use construction vehicles and equipment with the minimum practical engine size for the intended job. 	
149	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>VIA HAND DELIVERY AND E-mail : contactus@i-70east.com Mr. James Bemelen. P.E. Colorado Department ofTransport3tion 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>Re: City of Commerce City' s Comments on the I-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation, FHWA-CO-EIS-08-02-D</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: Commerce City is deeply concerned about the adequacy of the NEPA process to date and the potential impacts tha the proposed realignment alternatives will have on the City and its residents and workers. It was initially surprising to us that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS"), after more than five years of stud y, did not identify a preferred alternative. After further analysis, it became clear that the agency has been unable to determine which of the alternatives is preferred because it has not adequately studied the impacts or the northern realignment alternatives. Our primary comment is that the DEIS is inadequate because it includes a study area that extends two miles south of the realignment alternatives, but only two blocks north of those alignments.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>If the northern alignment alternatives will continue to be considered, a Supplemental DEIS is required to analyze the impacts on Commerce City. Only with the completion of a Supplemental DEIS in which a complete analysis of the impacts of the realignment Alternatives 4 and 6 is performed will Commerce City be able to evaluate the impacts of such alternatives fully.</p> <p>In addition to this general comment, the City offers the following specific comments which we have numbered for ease of reference:</p>	
150	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>1. <u>The DEIS is not concise.</u> The Council on Environmental Quality has issued regulations governing the preparation of all environmental impact statements. Those regulations provide that EISs should be concise¹ and analytic, rather than encyclopedic.² Specifically, they provide that the text of such statements shall normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.³ The City does not believe this project is of unusual scope or complexity, yet the DEIS is approximately 800 pages long with 1600 pages of appendices and technical reports. Unduly lengthy EIS reports discourage public involvement.⁴ Further, they decrease the likelihood that the statements will be read, even by the decision-makers or, if read, that the decision-maker will be able to retain the information in the statement in a way that will have a meaningful impact on the agency's decision.</p> <p>CDOT's NEPA Manual provides that the level of detail in an EIS should be commensurate with the scale of the proposed project and the related impact.⁵ Similarly, the CEQ regulations provide that length should vary first with potential environmental problems and then with project size. Since the DEIS is five times the normal length for such a document, we must conclude that CDOT believes this project will have extraordinary environmental impacts.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
151	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>2. <u>The study area is inadequate, arbitrary and capricious.</u> The DEIS states, on page 1-1, "An approximate one-mile buffer was created around the project limits to establish the project area." The "project limits" are shown on DEIS Exhibit 1-1 to include only the existing alignment of I-70. If Alternative 4 or 6 is chosen, then the "project" will be occurring in an area outside of the "project limits." Once the northern alignments were chosen as Alternatives 4 and 6, the "project" could be nearly a full mile north of the existing alignment of I-70. As a result, the project area as originally defined in fact extends only two blocks north of part of the proposed new alignment. In contrast, the project study area is two miles wide to the south of the proposed new alignment. There is no rational basis for studying an area two miles to the south of the proposed realignment and only two blocks north of it.</p> <p>The project study area should be coterminous with the "affected environment," as that term is used in NEPA regulations.⁷ As required by CEQ regulations and the CDOT NEPA Manual, the affected environment chapter of the DEIS should "succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration."⁸ (Emphasis added.) The DEIS makes clear that the agency considers areas a mile north and south of the existing alignment and, in some places, two miles south of the realignment, to be the environment that may be affected by the project; but, inexplicably, the agency implies that areas more than two blocks north of the proposed realignment could not possibly be affected by the construction of a new eight- or ten-lane interstate highway and are not worthy of study.</p> <p>The failure to alter the "project limits" and analyze impacts of the realignment alternatives on Commerce City is illustrated by the following, which is only a partial list:</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
152	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>a. The DEIS fails to include any local planning studies or land use plans from Commerce City in the list of plans that were considered in the development and evaluation of alternatives. DEIS §§ 1.1.2 and 5.4.2. CEQ regulations require an EIS to analyze possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of local land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.⁹ Since the realignment alternatives would pass through Commerce City, failure to analyze such conflicts with planning documents such as Commerce City's Comprehensive Plan, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Sand Creek Greenway Master Plan, New Lands Plan, and Prairieways Action Plan is patently deficient. By way of example, the lack of proposed local street and access improvements in conjunction with the realignment could negatively impact Commerce City's Prairie Gateway development on Quebec Street between 56th and 64th Avenues and potential redevelopment areas such as the Dog Track off of Highway 2 north of I-270, and would be inconsistent with Commerce City's land use plans and policies.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
153	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	b. In DEIS Exhibit 1-1, no portion of Commerce City is located within a neighborhood boundary.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
154	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	c. DEIS § 2.2.1 fails to mention a number of new developments along Quebec Street, including Commerce City's Prairie Gateway development with Dick's Sporting Goods Park, and potential redevelopment areas such as the Dog Track, Clermont, and Tiffany Subdivision. The impact of these developments on transportation demand should be analyzed in a similar fashion as developments in Denver and Aurora were.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
155	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	d. DEIS Exhibit 3-12 shows that improvements to the I-270/Quebec Street interchange, located in Denver, have been studied and considered as part of the I-70 East DEIS. DEIS § 3.3.2 also indicates that additional access to the Globeville area was considered along with other possible new interchanges on I-70. In contrast, no improvements to the I-270/Vasquez Boulevard/56th Avenue interchange, located in Commerce City, are considered in the I-70 East DEIS. The DEIS also does not analyze the interchange that would be required at I-270 and the realigned I-70 alternatives.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
156	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	e. The DEIS does not consider transportation impacts and mitigation measures for I-270 and adjacent streets and roadways for Alternatives 4 and 6 in Commerce City. DEIS § 4.2 purports to analyze the "Project Area Roadway System," and it does consider the impacts on numerous side streets near the existing alignment; but the DEIS does not include I-270 between I-70 and I-76, or other local streets and roadways very close to the northern realignment, in this analysis. As shown on DEIS Exhibit 4-1, no existing traffic counts were provided north of 52nd Avenue. Since the realignment will itself go north of 52nd Avenue, traffic counts are needed north of the proposed realignment. Without data for existing traffic volumes in the areas north of the proposed realignment, it is impossible to evaluate what impact constructing the realignment alternatives will have on those streets. Moreover, a review of the exhibits in DEIS § 4.2.3 reveals that future traffic volumes on side streets were modeled both north and south of the existing alignment. In contrast, no modeling was done for the local roads and streets that go north of the realigned portion of the interstate, except for Quebec Street at the I-270/I-70 interchange, including particularly I-270, Vasquez Boulevard and 56th Avenue. Moreover, no modeling was done for impacts to Brighton Boulevard, Colorado Boulevard and Highways 85/2/6 north of I-270, which will certainly occur if I-70 follows I-270. In addition to existing side street traffic volume data for the area north of the realignment, there must be modeling of expected future traffic volumes that is at least as thorough as the data prepared for the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 3. Indeed, the need for such analysis is greater for these areas in Commerce City, because, unlike the other alternatives, Alternatives 4 and 6 involve the construction of a brand new, very large interstate highway in an area that has never had one before.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
157	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	f. DEIS § 4.5 describes Denver's and Aurora's land use plans related to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, but fails to analyze Commerce City's similar plans. The DEIS should analyze Commerce City's Comprehensive Plan, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Sand Creek Greenway Master Plan, New Lands Plan, and Prairieways Action Plan.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
158	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	g. DEIS § 5.2.1.3 excludes all of Commerce City's public services and community organizations. Not a single school, health care facility, recreation facility, library or post office in Commerce City is discussed, although many of these facilities will or might be impacted by the realignment.	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
159	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>h. DEIS § 5.2.1.4 does not evaluate the impact of the proposed realignment on Commerce City's residential neighborhoods, including particularly those between 56th Avenue and I-270. The very brief mention of Commerce City in this section is merely descriptive of existing conditions. It does not, as the beginning of Chapter 5 promises, "disclose the effects that project alternatives would have on these resources."</p> <p>In DEIS § 5.2.2.5, the DEIS states, "Although the footprint of the [Alternative 6] alignment along the existing 1-270 alignment in Commerce City would require more residential and commercial/industrial acquisitions in Commerce City compared to Alternative 4, overall effects on neighborhood character and cohesion would be the same." First, this sentence is incorrect, as Commerce City's analysis indicates no residential properties will need to be acquired in Commerce City for Alternatives 4 or 6; a review of DEIS Appendix A - Alternative Maps indicates Alternative 6 is accomplished within existing CDOT right-of-way.</p> <p>This is another indication of the disregard with which the DEIS treats information about Commerce City. Second, this statement about Commerce City should be compared with the discussion in DEIS § 5.2.2.1 of the impacts of the No Action Alternative on the Elyria/Swansea neighborhoods in Denver: "The presence of 1-70 has disrupted neighborhood cohesion in Elyria and Swansea since its initial construction in the 1960s by bisecting the neighborhood. Further encroachment and reconstruction of the viaduct in the neighborhood will impact neighborhood cohesion." This disparate treatment of the impacts on neighborhood cohesion in Denver and Commerce City from incremental property acquisitions cannot be reconciled.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
160	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>i. DEIS § 5.2.1.6 compiles private sector employers for Denver and Aurora, but not Commerce City. Among the significant employers in Commerce City who would be affected by the proposed realignment are UPS, Shamrock Foods and Suncor Energy. More significant impacts to the many small business employers that would be adversely affected by Alternatives 4 and 6 also were not considered in the DEIS.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
161	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>J. The economic impacts on Commerce City are not adequately analyzed. According to the DEIS, Commerce City will lose from five and one half to nine times more property tax revenues from the realignment than Denver will lose, and from thirty to thirty-five times more property tax revenue than Aurora will lose, on a percentage basis. DEIS Exhibit 5.2-35 shows Denver losing as much as 0.11% of its property tax revenues from Alternative 4 West, while Commerce City would lose 0.60%, or 5.45 times as much as Denver. DEIS Exhibit 5.2-38 shows Denver losing as little as 0.08% of its property tax revenues from Alternative 6 East, while Commerce City would lose 0.70%, or 8.75 times as much as Denver. Similarly, DEIS Exhibit 5.2-35 shows Aurora losing 0.02% of its property tax revenues from Alternative 4, while Commerce City would lose 0.60%, or 30 times as much as Aurora. DEIS Exhibit 5.2-38 also shows Aurora losing 0.02% of its property tax revenues from Alternative 6, while Commerce City would lose 0.70%, or 35 times as much as Aurora.</p> <p>Despite these disparities, the DEIS minimizes the loss of property tax base in Commerce City ("Effects on the overall revenue stream in [sic] would be minimal." Virtually all of the discussion of "Economic Effects" in DEIS § 5.2.2.4, relating to Alternative 4, relates to the impacts on businesses along the existing I-70 alignment. The assertion that Alternative 4 would "support and accommodate economic growth that will increase the property tax base in ...Commerce City" is completely unsubstantiated. The same minimization of impacts on Commerce City, and the same lack of analysis is repeated, almost verbatim, in DEIS § 5.2.2.5, relating to Alternative 6.</p> <p>Based on what little information was provided in the DEIS related to business impacts in Commerce City as a result of building Alternatives 4 and 6, we estimate nearly 25 businesses would suffer direct adverse impact. This results in the loss of nearly 3,000 employees and loss of over \$227,000 in annual revenue to Commerce City since these businesses would be forced to re-locate and may not choose to do so within Commerce City.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
162	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>k. The Summary of Effects at the end of the Social and Economic Conditions section discusses only the neighborhoods of Elyria and Swansea. DEIS § 5.2.2.6. This may be due to the failure of the study to include most of the affected parts of Commerce City in the study area.</p> <p>As an illustration of this point, DEIS § 5.2.2.3, discussing the economic effects of Alternative 3 on the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood, states: "since over 90 percent of individuals working in Northeast Park Hill live outside the study area (see Exhibit 5.2-25), the effect on local employment would not likely be adverse." Since the study area encompasses an area only two blocks north of Alternatives 4 and 6 in Commerce City, while it includes a full mile north and south of the interstate in the segment that passes through Northeast Park Hill, the data for the number of people living and working in Commerce City do not provide a basis for comparing the effects on different neighborhoods.</p> <p>Moreover, since most of the people who live in Commerce City and who will be affected by the realignment live outside the study area, as the study area is improperly defined, the agency inappropriately dismisses the economic effect on local employment in Commerce City.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
163	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>l. DEIS § 5.4.1 describes "future developments that are anticipated to change land use patterns in the project area" that are located in Denver and Aurora. It fails to mention any such developments in Commerce City, such as the Prairie Gateway development, including Dick's Sporting Goods Park, potential redevelopment of the Dog Track, Clermont, and Tiffany Subdivision.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
164	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>m. Additional photo simulations are required in DEIS § 5.8.2 to show the impact of the proposed realignment on Commerce City, including particularly a simulation illustrating where the realigned I-70 will split off from I-270 over the Sand Creek Greenway at approximately 56th Avenue and Dahlia Street.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
165	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>n. DEIS § 5.14 notes that Denver and Aurora have specific regulations and/or ordinances related to the proper management of floodplains. Commerce City's similar floodplains regulations are not mentioned, although the realignment would pass through Commerce City.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
166	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>o. Similarly, DEIS § 5.20.2 lists noise restrictions in the municipal codes of Denver and Aurora, but fails to mention the noise restrictions in Commerce City's code.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
167	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>p. DEIS § 5.21.4 observes that Denver, Aurora and CDOT, as operators of large MS4s, have been required to obtain a Clean Water Act discharge permit for stormwater and to develop a stormwater management program. It fails to mention that Commerce City, as the operator of a small MS4, also was required to obtain a permit and to develop a stormwater management program.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
168	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>q. DEIS § 5.21.4 further observes that "new development occurring in the northeast portion of the study area would be subject to the Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria (CCD, 2006c)" The DEIS fails to acknowledge that new development could occur in Commerce City, or that Commerce City has its own Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria Manual.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
169	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>r. Commerce City initially chose merely to monitor the I-70 East Corridor NEPA process, since it was not included in the study area and only alternatives along the existing alignment were being considered. It was not until the realignment alternatives were put forward that we became actively involved in the process. Commerce City has participated in the public involvement process and has raised many of the issues addressed in this comment letter. Commerce City has met with CDOT on November 13, 2007 and on January 28, 2009. The November 2007 meeting resulted in Commerce City's re-sending to CDOT on January 8, 2008 our previous correspondence expressing some of our concerns; CDOT's April 21, 2008 response was that it would address these issues in the FEIS. Commerce City has submitted written comments and concerns on October 11, 2005, February 7, 2006, and January 8, 2008.</p> <p>In addition, no public hearings were held or scheduled to be held in Commerce City, even after the realignment option came forward. After we demanded a public meeting to seek citizen input in our city, the first such public hearing occurred on March 21, 2006. A second public hearing occurred in Commerce City in December 2008 after the DEIS was published. We understand that the agency held public hearings a few weeks ago, on March 4th and 5th in Denver, but once again did not hold a public hearing in Commerce City to reach out to residents who would be impacted by the realignment.</p> <p>The DEIS fails to document or address Commerce City's correspondence that raise these concerns, including the concern about the size of the study area after the alternative alignments were proposed. The DEIS is required to summarize the consultations required by environmental laws "to the extent appropriate at this stage in the environmental process."¹⁰</p> <p>There is only one reason why it might not be "appropriate" to summarize the consultations with Commerce City in the DEIS, and that is because the information does not exist to respond to Commerce City's concerns, due to the inadequate study area.</p> <p>In response to Commerce City's concerns, and in numerous places in the DEIS, the agency has asserted that it will address these important issues in the Final EIS. NEPA regulations require the DEIS to fulfill and satisfy to the fullest extent possible the requirements established for final statements, and to disclose and discuss all major points of view on the environmental impacts of the alternatives.¹¹ Commerce City is the municipality most likely to be adversely affected by the northern realignment. It has "major points of view" on the environmental impacts of the alternatives, and it is at the DEIS stage that such points of view should be discussed. It is only after the appropriate data have been collected that the draft EIS will provide the public with a fair analysis of the alternatives, which can then serve as a basis for Commerce City's comments.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
					<p>3. <u>The traffic analysis is both insufficient and flawed.</u></p> <p>As noted above, no data were collected about existing traffic counts on roads north of the proposed alignment. In addition, the agency has done no modeling of expected future traffic impacts on the local road and street network north of and adjacent to the realignment in the DEIS. If the realignment occurs with a full interchange at Colorado Boulevard, there will be an increase in local traffic along Colorado Boulevard at East 56th Avenue, I-270, Highway 85 and East 60th Avenue, especially since this is one of the few interchanges within the entire realignment. This should have been analyzed and addressed. Potential mitigation should not be left up to the local government when it is CDOT's realignment that is causing the need for mitigation. Furthermore, we cannot tell if the DEIS is consistent with the Highway 85 Corridor Study, since the DEIS study area does not include any area within the Highway 85 Corridor Study.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
170	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>The I-70 realignment will rebuild the Colorado Boulevard interchange and it is unclear if the design will be consistent with the Highway 85 Corridor Study preferred alternative for a grade separation at Highway 85 and 56th Avenue. Similarly, there is no analysis of the impacts on I-270 of the realignment alternatives. While some traffic currently takes I-270 instead of I-70 to get to areas in north Denver or southwestern Commerce City, or to I-25 north, I-76 and Highway 36, it would be safe to assume that more traffic will take I-270 if the existing alignment of I-70 were removed. Even if the agency expects there will be no impact, some analysis is necessary to reach that conclusion, particularly where a section of I-270 and I-70 will occupy the same traffic lanes.</p> <p>The DEIS references DRCOG's 2035 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP) yet most of the analyses in the DEIS use the 2030 MVRTP. The FEIS should use the 2035 or 2040 MVRTP depending on when it is revised. The 2035 MVRTP is continually referenced throughout the DEIS, so at a minimum 2035 MVRTP should be used.</p> <p>In addition, DEIS Exhibit 5.10-7 shows fewer vehicle miles traveled for Alternatives 4 and 6 than for Alternatives 1 and 3, although Alternatives 4 and 6 take a longer route to connect the same points that Alternatives 1 and 3 connect. (How much longer is never stated in the DEIS, although the number of miles added to the highway system by two of the alternatives seems like a relevant fact for analyzing environmental impact. Alternatives 4 and 6 appear to add 1.5 to 2 miles of highway to a segment that is currently less than 4 miles long.) The DEIS explains that traffic on the sections between Brighton Boulevard and I-270 would be lower for the realignment alternatives, because 40,000 vehicles per day are expected to be diverted from the interstate onto an improved 46th Avenue. DEIS § 4.2.3 at page 4-12. DEIS Exhibit 4-10 projects between 55,000 and 100,000 more vehicles per day for Alternatives 1 and 3 than it shows for Alternatives 4 and 6 on this stretch of I-70, so clearly 46th Avenue does not account for all of the reduced traffic on the interstate if the northern realignment is chosen.</p> <p>However, even if diversion onto side streets will cause less traffic on the interstate if the realignment is chosen, it is not appropriate to disregard such traffic in evaluating the environmental impacts of the alternatives. Indeed, the environmental impacts, including the resulting carbon footprint and particularly the air quality impacts, will be greater if vehicles use local streets, with more stopping and starting, instead of the interstate highway. To make a fair comparison of the environmental impacts of the alternatives, the VMT of the northern alignments should be added to the VMT of vehicles diverted from the interstate onto 46th Avenue.</p> <p>Moreover, there is no explanation as to why DEIS Exhibit 5.10-7 shows fewer vehicle miles per day for Alternative 6 than for Alternative 4, while the VMT for Alternative 3 are greater than for Alternative 1. Alternatives 1 and 3 are built on the existing alignment, with Alternative 3 including additional toll lanes. Alternatives 4 and 6 are built on the same alignment, with Alternative 6 including additional toll lanes.</p> <p>DEIS Exhibit 4-10 appears to show the same traffic volumes for each of Alternatives 1 and 3, and also the same traffic volumes for each of Alternatives 4 and 6, yet Exhibit 5.10-7 shows that the additional toll lanes for Alternative 3 increase VMT over Alternative 1, but the additional toll lanes for Alternative 6 decrease VMT as compared to Alternative 4 until the year 2030. There is no explanation for this anomaly in the DEIS or in the Technical Report. The DEIS does not adequately analyze or explain the effect of tolling, either on I-70 and I-270 or on side street traffic. For example, DEIS Exhibits 4-18 and 4-21 show that on the realigned I-70 west of Quebec Street, traffic volumes are identical for Alternatives 4 and 6 (except that approximately 3000 vehicles per day move from general purpose lanes to toll lanes in Alternative 6). The DEIS does discuss that more ROW would need to be acquired for Alternative 6, which would increase the impacts to businesses and residents.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>However, it does not address the common sense realities that many people may not be willing to pay a toll for a road they have used for decades. As a result, the toll lanes maybe virtually empty while the general purpose lanes (GPL) are at full capacity.</p> <p>Alternative 6's toll lanes mean fewer GPL will be built, which means congestion will increase on the GPL. For example, if there are four GPL that operate at a level of service (LOS) C, adding a toll lane and reducing the GPL from four to three may negatively reduce LOS from a C to an F. Further, adding toll lanes would increase traffic on local roadways. If the GPL are at full capacity, then at least some people will avoid paying the toll and avoid the congested GPL by exiting the highway in an attempt to bypass the congested area via local roads. This would affect low income households more than the rest of the traveling public, since the toll is regressive and poorer travelers may not be able to afford the toll or will be more inclined to avoid paying the toll.</p> <p>As discussed below, Alternatives 4 and 6 have many fewer interchanges than the No Action Alternative or Alternatives 1 and 3. While this may improve traffic flows on the interstate itself, the relative lack of exits will make it more difficult for local traffic and through traffic to take alternate routes when traffic on the realigned interstate highway is backed up due to a major accident or spill. The impact of the reduction in the number of interchanges on the potential for traffic jams has not been thoroughly analyzed.</p>	
171	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p><u>4. The air quality analysis is flawed.</u></p> <p>The air quality analysis notes that it cannot make meaningful or reliable estimates of MSAT emissions, but the agency claims it can qualitatively assess the levels of future emissions, comparing alternatives to each other and to baseline conditions. DEIS § 5.10.1.3. However, this qualitative assessment is flawed because it is based on projections of VMT for each of the alternatives. Since the DEIS unrealistically asserts that fewer vehicle miles will be traveled over the approximately six-mile stretch of Alternatives 4 and 6 than over the four-mile stretch of the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 3, the analysis of the air quality impacts of the alternatives is suspect.</p> <p>In addition, although the DEIS notes that the study area is non-attainment for the ozone 8-hour standard of 80 parts per billion, which designation occurred on November 20, 2007,¹² the most recent data presented in the DEIS is from 2006. The 8-hour standard was reduced to 75 ppb in 2008,¹³ and the DEIS fails to mention that the Denver area has already failed the new, more stringent standard. Since ozone is a chemical byproduct of VOCs and N02, and since VOCs and N02 are projected to be higher under all alternatives than under the No Action Alternative,¹⁴ the DEIS correctly notes that the project does not meet transportation conformity requirements.¹⁵ More important, since the emissions of VOCs and N02 are proportional to vehicle miles traveled, a reanalysis of projected VMT for each of the alternatives will allow a more accurate comparison of the air quality impacts and transportation conformity of the alternatives.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
172	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p><u>5. The DEIS fails to discuss impacts on global climate change.</u></p> <p>Colorado has a strategy to address global warming through the Colorado Climate Action Plan. As such global climate change must be addressed in the cumulative impact analysis section of the DEIS.¹⁶ The DEIS does include a cursory discussion of climate change in § 5.21.4 at p. 5.21-26. However, this discussion is taken verbatim from the CDOT NEPA Manual's Attachment 4, designated as "FHWA Standard Global Climate Change Language." The only project-specific "analysis" of the project's impact on global climate change is the insertion of a number into DEIS Exhibit 5.21-17 to reflect the percentage of statewide VMT represented by VMT in the project corridor. A NEPA document should not include boilerplate language. It should comprise a sincere effort to analyze the environmental impacts of individual alternatives for a specific project, including the project's cumulative impact on global warming. This DEIS fails to make that analysis.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
173	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>6. <u>The DEIS has not identified all reasonable alternatives.</u> It appears from the DEIS that most of the perceived environmental benefits of the northern alignments come, not from the realignment itself, but from the elimination of existing interchanges. The current alignment and Alternatives 1 and 3 have seven interchanges between Washington Street and Quebec Street, inclusive. Alternatives 4 and 6 have only three interchanges in the same segment of I-70. The reduction in the points of access and egress can be expected to improve safety and traffic flow on I-70 and, to some extent, reduce air emissions. If these were the primary objectives, the same benefits could be achieved by leaving I-70 on its current alignment and eliminating four interchanges. Indeed, the benefits would be greater for this alternative than for the realigned alternatives, since the distance from Washington Street to Quebec Street would be shorter. It may be that something similar to this alternative was screened, but it was not studied.</p> <p>One of the alternatives discussed in § 2.1 of the Alternatives Analysis and Screening Process Technical Report was "Convert the existing portion of I-70 from I-25 to I-270 to a limited access roadway. Additional capacity would be added to I-270 and I-76. The viaduct between Washington Street and Colorado Boulevard would be reconstructed or removed." Since this is discussed under the heading "Alternatives Off Existing Alignment," it is not clear that the alternative of eliminating four interchanges from the existing alignment was considered. In any event, this alternative did not make it past the first round of screening, because it did not meet the screening criteria of access, community or security. <i>Id.</i> at Table 3.2. Commerce City does not necessarily advocate for the elimination of interchanges on the existing alignment. Whether Commerce City would support this alternative depends on which alternatives would be eliminated and on what the studies of the effects of this alternative would show.</p> <p>We make this comment to illustrate that most of the relative merits of the northern realignment are the result of an unfair comparison to the other three alternatives under consideration. To make a fair comparison, another obvious alternative should be considered, which is to leave the interstate on its present alignment and improve traffic flow and safety by removing interchanges. On the other hand, if the limited access roadway alternative did not merit study because it would not serve the purpose and need of the project, neither would Alternatives 4 and 6.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
174	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>7. <u>The financial analysis is inadequate.</u> I-70 from I-25 to Brighton Boulevard was reconstructed in 2004 at a cost of \$32 million. A majority of this new stretch of I-70 (from Washington Street to Brighton Boulevard) would need to be demolished and rebuilt again to realign I-70 as described in Alternatives 4 and 6. To do so would waste taxpayer funds and demonstrate a failure of transportation planning. Similarly, the Colorado Boulevard flyover south of East 56th Avenue was reconstructed in 2005 at a cost of \$6.5 million. Alternatives 4 and 6 show side street improvements to Colorado Boulevard indicating that this new structure would be demolished. To do so would waste taxpayer funds and demonstrate a failure of transportation planning. Due to the inadequate study area for the alternative alignments and the failure to analyze traffic impacts north of the realignment on I-270, Vasquez Boulevard and East 56th Avenue, the DEIS fails to incorporate the costs of needed improvements to the I-270/Vasquez Interchange and the Vasquez connection to 56th Avenue.</p> <p>Alternatives 4 and 6 will impact more National Priorities List (NPL) hazardous waste sites, as well as other landfill sites, than the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 3 will. These will require additional evaluation, health and safety planning and possible mitigation. The costs of such additional efforts have not been factored into the cost estimates for the realignment alternatives. According to DEIS § 5.18.2, the only NPL site impacted by the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 3 will be the Vasquez Boulevard/I-70 NLP site, whereas Alternatives 4 and 6 will impact that site plus three others (the Chemical Sales NPL site, the Sand Creek Industrial NPL site, and the Woodbury Chemical NPL site). Although remediation has occurred to one extent or another at these sites, ongoing engineering and institutional controls at these sites may increase planning and construction costs for the northern realignments.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					In addition, the Tri-County Health Department has identified twelve former waste disposal sites that would be impacted by Alternatives 4 and 6 and that are not included in the DEIS analysis. A copy of TCHD's March 18, 2009, report commenting on the DEIS is attached and incorporated by reference. These sites may or may not contain hazardous wastes, but they may present other human health and safety risks and environmental hazards, the avoidance of which will add to the costs of the realignment alternatives. (see attachment) The financial analysis in the DEIS uses 2005 data. Economic conditions have changed dramatically since 2005, and more current data should be used.	
175	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>8. <u>The I-70 East traffic project was improperly segmented from the East Corridor transit project.</u> NEPA prohibits agencies from segmenting projects into pieces or components to minimize the environmental impacts caused by anyone segment. Contrary to the assertion in DEIS § 1.1.1, the two projects do not serve different travel markets and are not located in different corridors. While transit will not serve the needs of interstate travelers and truckers, reductions in traffic on I-70 as a result of transit may solve the congestion and safety issues that the alternatives in the I-70 East DEIS seek to address. As the DEIS notes in numerous places, adding traffic lanes and reducing congestion increases demand and, ultimately, vehicle miles traveled. The lesson of the last thirty years of highway construction is that building bigger highways simply creates the need to build still bigger highways.</p> <p>The FHWA and CDOT claim to be dedicated to reducing environmental impacts from highways (including contributions to global warming) through a variety of tools. These tools include better land use planning, technological improvements in vehicles, and, notably, promotion of mass transit. The argument can be made that reduced congestion on highways discourages the use of mass transit. Therefore, the transit project should be considered together with the traffic project, to arrive at the optimal solution to the area's transportation and environmental problems.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
176	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>9. <u>Realignment is not consistent with studies performed as required by federal highway laws.</u> Numerous provisions of federal law require extensive planning for the construction of federal highways. Some of these studies are listed in DEIS Exhibit 1-2. Commerce City is not aware that any of these plans or studies, prior to this DEIS, have analyzed or recommended realignment of this portion of I-70. The Major Investment Study of the East Corridor, performed in 1997 under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991, made recommendations for commuter rail, light rail, highway widening, and transportation management elements. It did not consider realigning I-70. Reconstruction of the I-70 viaduct from Washington Street to Brighton Boulevard in 2004 was done consistently with long-term plans for the I-70 East Corridor, even before the 1997 Major Investment Study ("MIS"), and certainly was not done with the expectation that most of those improvements would be rendered obsolete in less than a decade by realignment of the highway.</p> <p>Further, the 1997 MIS recommended improvements to the existing alignment of I-70, including additional lanes, between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard. More important, the MIS recommended widening I-270 to three lanes in each direction, and also that this construction should precede reconstruction of the I-70 viaduct so that I-270 and I-76 could serve as alternate routes during construction of improvements to I-70.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
					<p>10. <u>Impacts to wetlands have not been sufficiently studied and known impacts will preclude the realignment.</u> DEIS § 5.16 discusses impacts to Sand Creek from particulates and chemicals in surface sheet flows, but § 5.16.3 notes that best management practices could remove particulate pollutants in stormwater "with practical ranges from 10 to 90 percent." A range that broad is the equivalent of no information at all. Removal ranges of soluble pollutants and oil and grease are "less effective" than removal rates for particulates. This information belies the seemingly precise data presented for water quality impacts in each of the alternatives, but even those data show that Alternatives 4 and 6 will have more harmful impacts on Sand Creek than the other alternatives. DEIS Exhibit 5.15-3 shows that Alternatives 4 and 6 will impact over four times as many acres of wetlands as Alternatives 1 and 3 will. Only Alternatives 4 and 6 will impact the South Platte River, and only Alternative 6 will cause permanent effects to Sand Creek from shading. DEIS § 5.15.2.2.</p>	

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
177	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>DEIS § 5.15.3 concludes that Alternatives 1 and 3 could proceed under a Nationwide Permit for impacts to wetlands. In contrast, since the amounts of jurisdictional wetlands impacted by Alternatives 4 and 6 are greater, it will be necessary to obtain an individual permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. An individual 404 permit may not be issued if there is a practicable alternative that would have less adverse impact and does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences. 18 Alternatives 1 and 3 are such practicable alternatives. In addition, CDOT's NEPA Manual observes that CWA guidance requires the preferred alternative to be the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative.19 Therefore, known impacts discussed in the current DEIS preclude the realignment alternatives from being the preferred alternative.</p> <p>Furthermore, the NEPA/Clean Water Act Merger Report attached as Appendix C to the DEIS defers discussion of the preferred alternative and compensatory mitigation until the FEIS.</p> <p>It includes no discussion of whether the alternatives present significant adverse consequences to the aquatic environment or whether each of the alternatives is feasible and practicable. In the absence of this discussion, there is no way for the public generally, or Commerce City specifically, to provide meaningful comment on the Merger Report.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
178	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>11. <u>The northern alignments do not meet the purpose and need of the project.</u> The purpose of the project is to "implement a transportation solution that improves safety, access, and mobility and addresses congestion on I-70." DEIS § 2.1. The need is due to increased transportation demand, limited transportation capacity, safety concerns, and transportation infrastructure deficiencies. DEIS § 2.2. Unlike the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 3, Alternatives 4 and 6 actually decrease access and mobility within the study area by eliminating access points to the interstate and to the communities surrounding the realignment. In addition, failure to incorporate improvements to the already overloaded I-270/Colorado Boulevard/56th Avenue interchange, while increasing traffic at that interchange and at the interchange of existing I-270 and the realigned I-70 and on I-270 north of this interchange by eliminating other exits from I-70, will simply make a bad situation in Commerce City extremely worse.</p> <p>In § 1.4 of the Alternatives Analysis and Screening Process Technical Report, the agency notes that one of the transportation functions of the existing highway is to provide "access to adjacent employment areas, neighborhoods and new development centers." The project purpose includes both access and mobility. Access includes "facilitat[ing] connections between residential and business activity centers." <i>Id.</i>, Table 1-1. Mobility includes providing transportation choices that "balance the transportation needs of local, regional, and national users." <i>Id.</i> (emphasis added).</p> <p>As discussed above, one of the alternatives that was eliminated in the first round of the screening process was to reclassify I-70 on the existing alignment as a limited access roadway. That alternative was rejected in part because it did not provide adequate transportation access to and through the corridor, and it was not consistent with the general intent of local plans and policies. <i>Id.</i>, Table 3-2.</p> <p>The realignment Alternatives 4 and 6 were introduced late in the NEPA process. It is our understanding that the realignment may have been suggested as a means to address environmental justice issues in neighborhoods adjacent to the existing I-70 between I-25 and Colorado Boulevard, which were impacted 45 years ago when the I-70 viaduct was constructed. While environmental justice is an important consideration, it is neither the purpose nor the need for the project, and should not be driving the decision of which alternative makes the most sense from the standpoint of transportation capacity, cost, and environmental impact.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
179	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>12. <u>The northern alignments remove the possibility of phased improvements to this portion of I-70.</u> The DEIS touts one advantage of the northern alignments as being that work could proceed on the realignment while traffic continues on the existing highway, reducing the length of time that traffic would be interrupted by construction. DEIS § 5.2.2.4 at p. 5.2-50. The DEIS ignores that the construction of the northern alignment would have to be done all at once for any benefit to accrue to the system. In contrast, portions of the work on I-70 on its existing alignment could be done in phases. This would allow some improvements to occur sooner, and some expenditures to be deferred. Alternatively, the agency could quickly reconstruct the viaduct (the No Build Alternative) similar to how the I-35 project was done in Minnesota, which would likely result in a cost savings that then could be applied to improve existing I-270 and thus improving the entire transportation system in the metro area.</p> <p>DEIS § 3.9.2 discusses the virtue of phased implementation of the total project as funding becomes available. For such phasing to be beneficial, the FEIS must demonstrate that "each phase [of construction of the preferred alternative] has independent utility." Id. at p. 3-57. If the northern alignment will not be connected to the existing system until after it has been constructed, it is difficult to see how construction of any portion of the new alignment could have independent utility.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
180	3/31/09	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>13. <u>A Supplemental DEIS is required.</u> After determining the project study area, the agency has proposed alternatives that are substantial changes in the proposed action and that are relevant to environmental concerns. Moving a part of the highway a mile to the north will similarly change the location of the affected environment, and the study area should have been expanded to encompass the impacts on the new affected environment at the time those alternatives were proposed. The change in the design and scope of the project requires the agency to prepare a supplement to the DEIS. 20 As discussed above, this is information that should be collected and analyzed at the DEIS stage. The DEIS is required to fulfill the requirements of a Final EIS to the fullest extent possible. A major deficiency in the analysis of the DEIS should not wait until the Final to be corrected. The impacts on the affected environment in Commerce City should be analyzed before, and not simultaneously with, the agency's selection of a preferred alternative. It is information Commerce City had been requesting for some time before the release of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Final EIS is where the agency should respond to comments and, if it has not already done so, pick a preferred alternative. It is not the place to perform analyses that should have been completed and presented in the DEIS. If you have any questions about our comments, please do not hesitate to call us.</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
181	3/31/2009	Commerce City	Natale	Paul	<p>Footnotes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.2(c). 2. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.2(a). 3. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.7. 4. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, American Council of Engineering Companies, and the Federal Highway Administration, Improving the Quality of Environmental Documents § 1.3 (May 2006). 5. CDOT NEPA Manual § 4.5.1 (December 2008). 6. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.2(c). 7. CDOT NEPA Manual § 4.8. 8. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.15; CDOT NEPA Manual § 4.8. 9. 40C.F.R. § 1502.16(c). 10. 23 C.F.R. § 771.123(c) (2008). 11. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(a). 12. CDOT NEPA Manual § 9.2.1.1 at p. 9-8. 13. DEIS Exhibit 5.10-1, n.6. 14. DEIS § 5.10 Summary. 15. DEIS §5.1 0.1.1 at p. 5.10-8. 16. CDOT NEPA Manual § 9.27.2 at p. 9-218. 17. See CDOT NEPA Manual § 9.6. 18. 40 C.F.R. § 230. 12(a)(3). 19. See CDOT NEPA Manual § 9.6.1.1; see 40 C.F.R. § 230.10(a). 20. 40C.F.R. ' 1502.9(a);ll1d(c):23C.F.R.' 771.130(a)(l) and(f)(3);CDOTNEPAM<ll1ual' 4.21. <p>See (liso ,10 C.F.R. ' 150 1.7(c).</p>	letter sent via contact Us and hand delivered to CDOT
182	4/1/2009	DOI	Taylor	Willie	<p>Mr. James Bemelen Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, Colorado 80222</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation for I-70 Improvements, East from I-25 to Tower Road, Denver, Adams, and Arapahoe Counties, Colorado. The Department of the Interior (Department) reviewed the document and submits the following comments.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>Exhibit 5.22-1 and Section 5.13.3, Biological Resources, Special Status Species, Bald Eagles, Raptors, and Migratory Birds: These sections state that mitigation for these species will be conducted in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA does not permit compensatory mitigation. Under the MBTA construction activities in grassland, wetland, stream, and woodland habitats, and those that occur on bridges (e.g., which may affect swallow nests on bridge girders) that would otherwise result in the take of migratory birds, eggs, young, and/or active nests should be avoided.</p> <p>Although the provisions of MBTA are applicable year-round, most migratory bird nesting activity in eastern Colorado occurs during the period of April 1 to August 15. However, some migratory birds are known to nest outside of the aforementioned primary nesting season period. For example, raptors can be expected to nest in woodland habitats during February 1 through July 15. If the proposed construction project is planned to occur during the primary nesting season or at any other time which may result in the take of nesting migratory birds, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) recommends that the project proponent (or construction contractor) arrange to have a qualified biologist conduct a field survey of the affected habitats and structures to determine the absence or presence of nesting migratory birds.</p> <p>Surveys should be conducted during the nesting season. In some cases, such as on bridges or other similar structures, nesting can be prevented until construction is complete.</p>	letter emailed to C. Horn

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>It is further recommended that the results of field surveys for nesting birds, along with information regarding the qualifications of the biologist(s) performing the surveys, be thoroughly documented and that such documentation be maintained on file by the project proponent (and/or construction contractor) for potential review by the FWS (if requested) until such time as construction on the proposed project has been completed. The FWS's Colorado Field Office should be contacted immediately for further guidance if a field survey identifies the existence of one or more active bird nests that cannot be avoided by the planned construction activities. Adherence to these guidelines will help avoid the unnecessary take of migratory birds and the possible need for law enforcement action. These measures need to be implemented before and during project construction. Further, the FWS recommends that the Colorado Division of Wildlife's (CDOW) Recommended Buffer Zones and Seasonal Restrictions for Colorado Raptors, February, 2008, be used as a guideline for this project.</p> <p>Also, please be aware that the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has written specifications on avoiding impacts to migratory birds before and during construction. These measures will need to be implemented during the project.</p> <p>SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS The Department appreciates your consideration of properties in the Section 4(f) Evaluation; however, because there is no Preferred Alternative selected, we cannot concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources. We recommend that once you have selected a Preferred Alternative, specific mitigation measures be solidified for each of the affected Section 4(f) properties and documented in the Section 4(f) Evaluation. We appreciate the opportunity to review this document. If you have any questions concerning fish and wildlife, please contact Alison Deans Michael at (303) 236-4758. If you have questions regarding Section 4(f), please contact Roxanne Runkel at (303) 969-2377.</p> <p>Sincerely, Willie R. Taylor Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance</p>	
183	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	<p>James Bemelen, P.E. Colorado Department of Transportation 2000 South Holly Street Denver, CO 80222</p> <p>RE: Transmittal of Denver Comments on 1-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Mr. Bemelen: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 1-70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (November 28, 2008). This letter summarizes Denver's requests for clarification and further analysis which should be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and is accompanied by a detailed matrix of Denver staff comments which specifically reference the various sections of the DEIS.</p> <p>Over the past five years, the City and County of Denver has provided staff support and leadership for this analysis of alternatives and environmental impacts for future improvement of I-70 East from I-25 to Tower Road. As a significant east-west interstate, I-70 serves not only trips for Denver residents, but also regional and national travel and freight transport needs.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
					<p>Because relieving congestion and providing safe travel on I-70 is an important element to improving Denver's overa transportation system, Denver staff members have worked closely with the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and the public to narrow alternatives to those which have the greatest public benefit with the fewest impacts.</p> <p>Since this highway segment is primarily located in Denver, any future expansion or improvement of the highway will have significant short- and long-term impacts for adjacent Denver neighborhoods. Appropriate mitigation of these impacts, both during construction, and after completion, is critical to Denver.</p> <p>Overall, the DEIS accurately represents the preferred alternatives, alignments, and design alternatives which evolved through the technical analysis and public outreach process. After thorough review of all of the DEIS documents for the I-70 East corridor, Denver would like the FEIS to address the following major issues, as well as those contained in the attached matrix.</p>	
184	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	<p>Integrity of the EIS Public Outreach and Technical Analysis - Denver staff observed during the recent Public Hearings on the I-70 DEIS that the over five-year process has been dynamic, and has changed from the extensive public outreach that was conducted from July 2003 through June 2006, up to the present. After June 2006, when it was determined that the highway and transit elements of the I-70 East Corridor EIS would move forward as independent projects, most of the public involvement has been associated with the East Corridor Transit EIS. The input from the recent Public Hearings on this I-70 East EIS is not indicative of the substantial public involvement of the first three years for the I-70 East Corridor EIS. The community engagement and involvement, which was a primary objective of the community outreach process, was very extensive and successful.</p> <p>The public outreach identified many negative impacts associated with existing I-70 that resulted in the development of the "Re-Alignment" Alternatives. After review of the DEIS, Denver is very concerned that significant public support for the "Re-Alignment" alternatives has been and will be minimized in the development of a preferred alternative in the FEIS.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
185	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	<p>Alignment Alternatives - The "Existing" and the "Re-alignment" alternatives meet the Purpose and Need determined early in the EIS process. However, while the Existing alignments appear less expensive overall, and financially easier to phase, they are less desirable from a construction disruption and an Environmental Justice perspective.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
186	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	<p>Environmental Justice (EJ) - The DEIS conclusively shows that the study area represents a significantly higher proportion of minority and low-income households than in Metro Denver overall. From an EJ perspective, it is clear that the adverse effects under Alternatives 1 and 3 - expansion and improvement of the highway in the "existing alignment" - would continue to disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations in Denver neighborhoods, especially in the Elyria-Swansea neighborhood.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
187	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	<p>Mitigation - The suggested mitigation strategies for the impacts of Alternatives 1 and 3 are inadequate. These alternatives would further erode neighborhood character and cohesiveness seriously impacted by the original highway construction. Although not without negative impacts, Alternatives 4 and 6 (the "Re-alignment") in essence are the mitigation for Alternatives 1 and 3. The travel time is the same for both alternatives, but the congestion is greater for Alternatives 1 and 3. The costs for Alternatives 4 and 6 are greater, but the constructability, and the ability to phase construction, are enhanced. For much of the construction period, the existing highway lanes could b maintained while the parallel re-alignment segment is under construction, thus simplifying traffic control substantially and preventing costly, inconvenient traffic detours.</p>	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
188	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	Phasing and financing - Given the lack of funding, there is an implied preference in the DEIS for Alternatives 1 and 3 that suggests that the I-70 viaduct could be replaced at a much lower cost than building the Re-alignment from Brighton to Quebec via I-270. Cost savings and reduction of community, economic, and social impacts attributed to the Re-alignment over the Existing alignment are not adequately addressed in the DEIS Denver is ready and willing to assist CDOT and FHWA articulate the desirability of the Re-alignment alternative and to lobby for funding to implement it.	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
189	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	Economic Development - I-70 is the major route for tourists to the mountains and carries high volumes of commercial truck traffic. The DEIS does not even mention this difference between the alignment alternatives, much less quantify the consequences that could offset some of the difference in cost. The disruption during construction is longer, and on the surface, greater with Alternatives 1 and 3. The necessary detours would significantly impact the Downtown and Central Denver network, and would result in longer, less convenient travel trips through the urban core for many years. The Re-alignment alternatives would reduce the construction duration by at least a year to two years, which is a substantial measurable benefit to the region in these difficult economic times.	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
190	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	Preferred Alternative in the FEIS - Since complete funding for the 1-70 improvements has not yet been identified, Denver suggests the use of a "Phased" Record of Decision (ROD) which would allow phased implementation - similar to the model developed by FHWA and CDOT for the Valley Highway (1-25) Environmental Impact Statement completed several years ago. Without moving expeditiously to complete the FEIS, property owners and businesses on all alignments would face an uncertain future for an extended period of time.	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
191	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	Executive Summary - Many readers will focus on the Executive Summary and the summaries in the individual chapters and sections. The FEIS should provide more accurate and complete summaries of the information, with conclusions or summaries for each section, which are then brought forward to the Executive Summary.	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
192	3/31/2009	CCD	Vidal	Guillermo	2035 Regional Travel Data - Given the length of time that the DEIS has been underway, much of the data in the DEIS is outdated. In the interim, the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) updated its regional travel demand model for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The FEIS should provide analysis of the 2035 data to determine if any of the impacts, alternatives analysis, or mitigation measures would change. If you have any questions about these comments, or the detailed comment matrix which is attached to this correspondence, please contact Denver's Project Manager for the East Corridor, Jess Ortiz, Denver Public Works Department, Phone: 720-913-1781, or E-mail: jess.ortiz@denvergov.org . Sincerely, Guillermo V. Vidal, Manager	letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
193	3/31/2009	CPD			Executive Summary 1. It would be helpful to have a map showing the alternatives. One map could be a simplified version on the map showing neighborhoods and showing the existing alignment versus the re-alignment.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
194	3/31/2009	CPD			Executive Summary 2. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (see below) a. Describe impact on Swansea Elementary as an encroachment. Need to indicate that will encroach on the south alternative but will be requiring that the school be relocated for the 1 and 3 north. Should identify the specific mitigation.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
195	3/31/2009	CPD			b. Alternatives 1 and 3 indicate that there will be improved mobility for local neighborhoods. This is not true for Elyria-Swansea (E-S) given that the York interchange is eliminated, streets that currently go under I-70 are terminated, and that by the numbers provided that relatively few residents use I-70.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
196	3/31/2009	CPD			c. Do not identify mitigation for loss of character and cohesion for E-S.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
197	3/31/2009	CPD			d. Under induced development, the potential changes along 46th Avenue are positive ones.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
198	3/31/2009	CPD			e. Under noise, the information under alternatives 4 and 6 are inaccurate. Swansea is incorrectly identified as a neighborhood not experiencing noise. Globeville and Montbello are not impacted by these alternatives in terms of noise. Same problem in 2nd paragraph.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
199	3/31/2009	CPD			Executive Summary Under construction, it shows that all alternatives are the same from the perspective of temporary congestion and road closures. In fact, these transportation impacts are quite different for the re-alignment options.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
200	3/31/2009	CPD			Section 2.1 Chapter 2 – Purpose and Need The Project purpose is too narrowly defined. It makes it harder to distinguish among alternatives. Not recognizing economic development is a problem.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
201	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.2 Suggest adding under community, "seek solutions that improve community cohesiveness"	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
202	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.4.8 The explanation as to why the tunnel was eliminated needs elaboration (see below) 1. Is access to Steele necessary? Could use 46th to get to I-70 at Colorado or Brighton. It says impacts to these 3 roads but does not quantify the impacts. Do not explain the sight distance well.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
203	3/31/2009	CPD			2. Identifies constructability problems but not adequately. It seems like it would be very difficult to connect a tunnel with the current viaduct. This is not mentioned.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
204	3/31/2009	CPD			3. Doesn't quantify how much more ROW is needed.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
205	3/31/2009	CPD			4. Discusses problems with north south access but actually Alternatives 1 and 3 cut off all access between York and Steele. You could connect to 46th. Do not get this.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
206	3/31/2009	CPD			5. On page 31, for the below-grade option, mention that access would be closed to major streets for an extended period of time. Isn't this true of tunnel as well. Should mention it.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
207	3/31/2009	CPD			6. Should provide an exhibit for tunnel like 3-46 for the tunnel.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
208	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.5.5 Need to identify clearly the advantages of re-alignment (see below and refer to comparison of alternatives 1 & 4 Attachment at end of comment matrix - page 11). 1. Fewer number of years for construction	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
209	3/31/2009	CPD			2. May even be greater than what is stated it terms of when I-70 is under construction since re-alignment could be built first and then viaduct torn down and 46th built. Never states how long this phase would take?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
210	3/31/2009	CPD			3. Less disruption and congestion during construction	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
211	3/31/2009	CPD			4. This leads to less impacts on commerce and on economic development which is never recognized much less quantified. This is critical given the amount of truck traffic on I-70 and its roll of getting tourists to the mountains.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
212	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.5.6 The costs of disruptions to commerce should be quantified and recognized in this cost table.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
213	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.5.6 Very concerned about how the lack of money is dealt with. Need to start by picking best alternative and see how it could be paid for. Indicate may only built a phase that can demonstrate independent utility. Not sure of the implications.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
214	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 3, Section 3.6 There are additional alignment considerations that should be mentioned (see below). 1. Some traffic head west on I-70 is heading for I-25 north. How much of this traffic does and could E-470 take as a tollway or if it was free? Would that change the traffic numbers on I-70 and impact the need for more capacity?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
215	3/31/2009	CPD			2. Although dismissed, it seems like the inclusion of the I-70 to I-270 to I-76 and back to I-70 should have been more consideration. The ROW is much wider for I-270 and perhaps this could be tolled to pay for it.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
216	3/31/2009	CPD			3. The numbers show heavy traffic from I-225 to I-270. It is not clear why direct, tolled lanes were not considered for this.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
217	3/31/2009	CPD			4. An option to consider may be to include tolled lanes from I-225 to I-270 to I-76 that becomes the new I-70. The realignment becomes Business I-70 and is built to highway rather than Interstates standards to reduce impacts to Elyria and the NWSS, and 46th Avenue becomes a 4-lane arterial for local traffic.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
218	3/31/2009	PW PP			Chapter 3, Section 3.9.2, pg 3-57 The text refers to "\$92.6 million in local funds for Havana Street/Central Park Boulevard interchange reconstruction. This historical reference should be updated in this section and/or other appropriate sections of the the FEIS. Information regarding the I-70: Central Park Boulevard Interchange should be amended to reflect the recent changes in funding, environmental clearance and other approvals, and scope resulting from additional federal funding availability (Econ Recovery Act funds and a 2009 earmark. The text should be similar to the recent amendment to the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) 2008-13 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
219	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4 Should add a table that shows where I-70 traffic goes and is projected to go: start or end in corridor, DIA, north on I-25, through traffic, to downtown, etc.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
220	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2, pg 4-7 Appears to be anomaly in that higher % of day is congested on I-225 to I-270 than I-25 to York but speed is much lower on I-25 to York.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
221	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3, pgs 4-25, 26 The description of what happens to streets in the York to Steele is very confusing. A diagram is needed here to show it. It dramatically impacts connectivity in the Swansea neighborhood. Also, do not mention connectivity to area south of I-70 between Market Lead and Colorado Blvd. The access will be really poor with only one way to get to it. Is the Fire Dept. ok with this?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
222	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3, pgs 4-25, 26 For alternatives 4 and 6, need to explain why Brighton traffic is routed on 48th and on Race instead of creating a new Brighton along the re-aligned I-70.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
223	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3, pgs 4-25, 26 The section on Vasquez to Colorado Boulevard makes no sense.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
224	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 4, pg 4-25 Second Bullet – The first sentence should refer to the westbound exit ramp instead of the eastbound.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
225	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 4, pg 4-25 Second to last paragraph – The impacts of this change in the roadway grid need to be analyzed and mitigated if needed.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
226	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 4, pg 4-26 The wording of the third paragraph does not make sense to me. What does the sentence that starts with, "With the removal of the viaduct ..." intend to say? Should this say that by removing the viaduct, traffic circulation along 46th would be improved? In addition, is the circulation really improved or is it really just the progression along 46th is improved? Will the 46th progression improve between York and Steele since it appears that the traffic will now need to merge with off-ramp traffic? This paragraph also states that the diverting traffic in the Swansea neighborhood would have little affect on the operations of the streets, but what does it do to the traffic around the school or other properties where you are concentrating traffic?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
227	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 4 There are several locations where off-ramp traffic merges in to 46th Avenue or the frontage road traffic. How are these intersections controlled? Does the 46th traffic stop? Or is the intent to have a free flow weave and merge?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
228	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 4 The legend on some of the figures in the alternative maps does not match some of the roads. For example, is you are heading WB in alternative 3S and want to get off at Steele, then you need to exit before Colorado which would make the segment of ramp between Colorado and Steele a CD road. In addition, the frontage road between Elizabeth and Milwaukee is not shown with the frontage road color but are called frontage roads on page 4-25	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
229	3/31/2009	PW TES			Chapter 4, pg 4-26 On page 4-26 of the EIS, did you mean alternatives 4 & 6 in-lieu of alternatives 3 & 6?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
230	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.2.4, pg 4-31 Exhibit 4-25, 4th row makes no sense.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
231	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, pg 4-39 In section 4.5, should mention Blueprint Denver and the Strategic Transportation Plan	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
232	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4 In section 4.5.2, indicate that will shift bike route from Clayton to York/Josephine. These streets are too busy for on-street bike route without dedicated or separated bike lanes.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
233	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, pg 4-42 Mention that little impact to operations of the streets but ignore that connectivity is harmed for neighborhood residents and ability to get to places within Elyria-Swansea through multiple modes.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
234	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 4, Section 4.7, pg 4-43 Exhibit 4-32 Did not mention the discontinuation of Clayton bike route without a good alternative. Should mention that number of crashes is much lower for the re-alignment alternatives as stated on page 4-41.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
235	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.2 overall Summary is totally inadequate. It states that overall, impacts on social and economic conditions will be positive. It ignores the significant negative impacts on the Elyria-Swansea neighborhood that are mentioned in later sections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
236	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.2 overall The high rate of households without vehicles in the study area (which in the Denver neighborhoods is 2-3 times greater than the state average) suggests that the finding that "beneficial socioeconomic effects generally result from increased capacity on I-70, compared to the No Action Alternative" does not adequately evaluate the benefits and impacts to Denver neighborhoods. How do increased auto capacity and property impacts benefit households with no automobiles, especially when the impacts will make it more difficult for local residents to walk within their neighborhoods.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
237	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.2 How would the 2.2 year difference in construction time for alternatives 4 and 6, compared to 1 and 3 affect the overall cost of the project?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
238	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2.17 Says small areas of residential in Elyria-Swansea but have 1800 units and 6,700 persons which is one of largest neighborhoods. Elyria-Swansea is the ___ largest neighborhood in terms of dwelling units and the ___ largest in terms of population. Do Cudahy and Denver Union Stockyards still exist?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
239	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-19 Some of information is inaccurate or incomplete. For instance, Facilities mentioned not in NE Park Hill.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
240	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5; pg 5.2-38 Implies residents might see bigger, wider I-70 as an improvement. What is this based on? Several statements like this that are not based on any evidence. Says that character and cohesion impacts do not take into account mitigation but no mitigation is proposed so this is ingenuous. Not sure I would characterize the Welton Street corridor as a "thriving mixed-use district."	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
241	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-42 to 43 All of the impacts to Elyria-Swansea need to be included and described: lose York interchange, lose homes, potentially lose school, lose businesses including neighborhood markets, lose street connectivity.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
242	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-52 Should mention that removal of I-70 viaduct would add value to properties in Elyria-Swansea.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
243	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Summary of effects leaves important ones out and doesn't clearly state ones that are addressed. Table is incomplete. States that there is improved mobility and access and reduced congestion across study area for Alternative 1. This is not true for Elyria-Swansea.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
244	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 The discussion of the National Western Stock Show and its economic impact does not include the fact that the facility is deciding whether to remain in this location or move to another site, potentially outside the city.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
245	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Does the reference to future mitigation measures suggest that the No Action N alternative proposes not relocating the Swansea Elementary School, despite impacts to the playfield?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
246	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Is any mitigation proposed for the potential "effects on the value of homes that would be closer to I-70 if improvements are made"?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
247	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Does alternative 1 N imply that the Swansea Elementary School would have to be relocated? Why not state that directly? What is the range of potential mitigations?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
248	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 The displacement of the markets under alternative 1 is a very significant impacts given the lack of a nearby full-service grocery and the low rates of household vehicle access. What kinds of mitigations beyond the typical business relocation assistance could be offered?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
249	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 What is the source for the statement that 90% of those working in Elyria, Swansea and Northeast Park Hill live outside the EIS study area?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
250	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 How much shorter is the projected construction period for alternatives 4 and 6 versus alternatives 1 and 3?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
251	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 What is the proposed mitigation for the loss of the Stockyards Post Office under alternative 4? The suggestion that residents could ride the bus to a neighboring post office is an unacceptable mitigation, unless CDOT is proposing to provide bus fare.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
252	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Based on the number of residential property impacts, how could Elyria residents see the relocation of the highway through their neighborhood as under alternative 3E as a "neutral effect"? This statement is at best speculative and at worst disingenuous.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
253	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.2-57 Under alternative 4 W, has the EIS explored with the National Western complex whether it could be reconfigured within the remnant property not impacted by the project itself?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
254	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.3 The summary still includes this incomplete statement "Some adverse effects would affect all populations to the degree that they are geographically specific and located close to low-income and/or minority populations." What does this mean?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
255	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.3 The new summaries added to the EJ section are an aid to the reader. Thank you. Now, however, there are so many sections labeled "summary" in the EJ chapter that it's a little confusing and I'm wondering if there could be a minor labeling or formatting change to better designate the sections. For example, the sections labeled "Summary of Effects" (carryover from previous draft) could be changed to simply "Effects" or "Adverse Effects". Or the new sections labeled "Summary:_[by option]" could have some formatting change (e.g., a text box or indenting) to help better delineate them. Just looking for some simple labeling or formatting change that helps the reader better understand the distinction among all the sections labeled as "summary".	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
256	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-8 Should have a conclusion on whether the study area or parts of it meet EJ guidelines and whether impacts and benefits are disproportional.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
257	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-8 There are severe limitations in using Stapleton school enrollment data as a surrogate for population minority status. While we understand CDOT's intent to address this issue in the FEIS (with updated information), none-the-less we suggest that the severe limitations of the current methodology be acknowledged in the text, since the surrogate method is being presented to the public in the DEIS.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
258	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.3.3.1 Section labeled that Resource effects are similar in all alternatives. This seems clearly to be false.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
259	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-14 Does the no alternative cut off Elyria-Swansea north-south road access like 1 and 3?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
260	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-20 This statement "the adverse impacts would be predominantly borne by low-income and minority populations" is an extremely important conclusion and should show up in the various summaries.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
261	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-20 The DEIS has convincingly established that the study area contains higher concentrations of minority and low-income populations relative to Denver and Colorado. How does this finding affect the range of mitigation options beyond the typical requirements, such as additional outreach efforts, conformity with the Uniform Act, and Spanish-language communications? As the DEIS observes, it will be especially challenging for these displaced residents to find new housing based on their incomes.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
262	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-21 The statement about relocating the school within 1 to 2 miles minimizes the significance of access from an isolated neighborhood to its only school. Need to commit to more than this.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
263	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.3.3.4.1, pg 5.3-21-23 Alternative 1 and 3 North - On page 5.3-21 (first paragraph under Summary of Effects, last sentence) the text states "(the 93 housing units represent about four percent of the neighborhood)". However on the top of pg 5.3-23, (Summary: Alternative 1 North, second sentence) the text states the 93 housing units represent 5 percent of the housing stock in the neighborhood. The text provides seemingly contradictory data. Please verify and correct as appropriate. Please verify all data presented in the new summaries is correct.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
264	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.3-29 Need to mention loss of access (especially north-south on #1 and #3).	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
265	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.3 All of the impacts need to be addressed in the summary table, the summary and in the body of 5.3. They include (See below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widened highway, widening split in the neighborhood • Walling off neighborhood to mitigate sound impacts • Loss of only neighborhood school in the north alternative and weak statements on mitigation • Reduced neighborhood serving businesses • Eliminating north-south connectivity • Loss of homes 	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
266	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, section 5.4 Summary - Another instance of inadequate and misleading summary. Says "all build alternatives are consistent with overall goals of local and regional plans to improve regional mobility and enhance movements to and from urban centers." However, alternatives 1 and 3 and the No Action alternative are not consistent with local plans because they further erode neighborhood character and cohesiveness. Alternatives 4 and 6 cited inconsistency with the Elyria/Swansea Neighborhood Plan (1983) is not accurate since the plan did not consider the benefits of zoning changes in the context of the viaduct being removed. As the DEIS observes elsewhere the removal of the viaduct would have benefits to community cohesion, which would in fact require zoning changes to be implemented.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
267	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.4 In the discussion of induced development under alternatives 4 and 6, it also is likely there would be induced development along 46th Avenue where the viaduct would be demolished, which would be a benefit to the community.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
268	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.4 While all the proposed alternatives may be consistent with the overall goals and the local and regional plans to improve regional mobility to urban centers, they are not necessarily consistent with plans that the EIS did not examine, such as the Strategic Transportation Plan, Greenprint Denver, and the Climate Action Plan. The Strategic Transportation calls for measurements of person trips not auto trips, measuring transportation capacity by using travel sheds instead of specific corridors, and no new growth in the physical footprint of Denver's road network. The DEIS has major inconsistencies with these requirements. Greenprint Denver calls for a 10% reduction in 1990 per capita greenhouse gas emissions by 2011. The Climate Action Plan calls for a 15% reduction from 1990 totals in auto trips and vehicle miles traveled by 2012. It will be more difficult to achieve these goals with CDOT cutting off the connectivity of local streets and increasing auto capacity.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
269	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.5 While the DEIS finds that "very few sites the provide services to the immediate neighborhood ... would require relocation," the displacement of community markets is a very significant impact given the lack of a nearby full-service grocery and the low rates of household vehicle access. The displacement of the Stockyards Post Office raises similar concerns. What kinds of mitigations beyond the Uniform Act could be offered?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
270	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.5 Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in the relocation of Swansea Elementary School. The proposed mitigation of relocating within 1 to 2 miles is not satisfactory.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
271	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.5 The discussion of the potential relocation of the National Western Stock Show does not include the fact that the facility is deciding whether to remain in this location or move to another site, potentially outside the city. Will the FEIS look at potential configurations to retain the complex on the remnant property?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
272	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.5, pg 5.5-10 A significant distinguishing characteristic of alternative is that although 4 and 6 affect more commercial acreage they affect much less building square footage. Attached is a chart showing this. Suggest that this chart be added.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
273	3/31/2009	Division of Real Estate			Chapter 5, Section 5.5 Category R - Work closely with City agencies including Office of Economic Development and City Councilmember's in affected areas.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
274	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.6.1, pg 5.6-11, 13 Do not believe the STAMINA Model has given an accurate assessment of noise levels. Understand attempts were made to account for shortcomings of the model however based on the information supplied, I believe the levels predicted are understated due to the model's inability to account for multiple lanes, complex interchanges or viaducts, as previously stated. Provided that the TNM Model is used for the FEIS as noted in the "How comment addressed:" box in the previous review comment form, will it be as feasible to accommodate any potential mitigation at that advanced stage of planning as opposed to if it were to be modeled now and the TNM Model indicated a need for noise mitigation where previously the STAMINA Model had not?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
275	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.7.4, pg 5.7-35 Typically pile driving is the single loudest noise source and historically has not been allowed during nighttime hours even with a noise variance. I believe the overall primary and long-term source of construction noise to be considered will be construction activities such as demo hammers on trackhoes, rubble load outs, tailgate and bucke bang.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
276	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.7.4, pg 5.7-35 Construction noise is still exempt Monday through Friday 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. however as of June 16, 2008 exempt hours on Saturday and Sunday have changed and are now 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Outside of exempted hours and before 10 p.m. allowed noise levels for residential receptors is 55 db(A), for commercial receptors is 65 db(A), for industrial receptors is 80 db(A) and for public receptors is 75 db(A). The noise levels from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. listed in section 7.4 page 34 are correct.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
277	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.8 The visual simulations underscore the statement that the new elevated structure that replaces the existing viaduct would result "in an increase in the visible mass of the highway." These visual impacts are much more disconcerting in the context of the residential neighborhood than in the areas that are already commercial/industrial in character.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
278	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.8 The statement that visual mitigation measures "will be developed through a collaborative process during final design to reflect the needs of individual neighborhoods and the local aesthetic context" is very vague. Are there any examples that can be provided in the FEIS? We encourage CDOT to exploit opportunities for public art as much as possible as part of mitigation. Based on the financing challenges, how realistic is it to expect the above statement will be borne out?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
279	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, pg 5.8-11 Should show a simulation of what 46th Avenue would look like with 4 lanes compared to what I-70 and 46th are like today.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
280	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.10 Is there a way to quantify the location of sensitive receptors for each alternative? It seems that no-action, and alternatives 1 and 3 would have much more sensitive receptors than alternatives 4 and 6, but no quantitative comparison is provided.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
281	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-1 to 2 The Jerritt citation "exposures assigned on distance to traffic or traffic counts near the home are prone to . . . errors . . . and biased results" should be revised such that the reviewer can be confident that with the omissions it is still contextually correct.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
282	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-4 Exhibit 5-10.1 should show the 2008 0.15 ug/m3 rolling 3-month Pb standard.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
283	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-4, Exhibit 5.10-1 The 24-hr PM10 standard is not correctly characterized in the footnote. The correct footnote should read "Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years."	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
284	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-5 to 7 Terms like modestly and minimal should be avoided. Just say "emissions are expected to be <10% higher than....." I would strike the last sentence. You do not conduct ozone modeling so this statement is purely speculation.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
285	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-5 to 25 There have been previous PM construction monitoring efforts associated with I-70/Brighton Blvd and the T-REX project. The data is available, and it shows that CDOT violated the PM10 annual NAAQS for 3 straight yrs at 44th&Brighton and also violated the 24 hr NAAQS in 2001 & 2002. Since construction of the highway is likely to be of the greatest concern to the community, this really needs to be a focal point for CDOT and FHWA. T-REX data was better, with no monitored NAAQS violations. Relying on past monitoring data for construction is much more useful than materials volume surrogates. CDOT was asked several years ago by the Air Quality Committee to report the monitored data from the previous I-70 work. The data should be reported in this document, with the necessary caveats. CDPHE and Denver have this info and should be consulted well in advance of the FEIS being released to discuss future monitoring plans due to the immediate proximity of sensitive receptors.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
286	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-6 The 1997 8-hr ozone standard was not exceeded at Welby, as this was a single exceedance and not an 8-hr max. Table 3 should be revised to show the 4th max, 3-yr (rolling) average concentrations and should include 2007 and 2008. Monitors whose values exceed the 2008 75ppb 8-hr standard should be denoted.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
287	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-6 Exhibit 5.10-3 should also include data from the Carriage Air Monitoring site (23rd Ave & Julian St). This monitor will show several additional 8-hr avg ozone exceedances.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
288	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-6, Exhibit 5.10-3 The 98th percentile concentration is only the 2nd max when monitoring is on a 1-in-6 day frequency. For PM2.5, CAMP and Swansea monitor daily, which means there could be up to 7 allowable exceedances per year. The listed values in the table need to reflect the 98th percentile concentration based on the sampling frequency at that monitor (CDPHE can help with this or EPA's AQS website can be accessed).	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
289	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10.2, pg. 5.10-8 The 1997 8-hr ozone standard was not exceeded at Welby, as this was a single exceedance and not the 3 year average of the 4th highest 8-hr max.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
290	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10.1.2.1, pg 5.10-8 to 25 It is not appropriate to compare risk assessment for behavioral risks (alcohol consumption) to environmental risks (urban air pollution). Moreover, the "J-shaped" dose response relationship for alcohol consumption is not relevant to MSAT exposure. This paragraph should be omitted or a more appropriate example of observable exposures and responses should be utilized.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
291	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10.2, pg 5.10-10 The term "flattening of improvements" should be revised so that it is clear you are referring to "maximum fleet penetration of vehicles with catalytic converters."	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
292	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10.1.2.1, pg 5.10-12 Exhibit 5.10-5 does not make sense. It states that "smooth flow reduces emissions by a factor of nearly 20." However, the HC emissions graphed appear to range from ~17.5-19.5, which is not even a factor of 2 reduction. This graph appears to be pulled from the UC Davis paper and is not presented in the correct context.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
293	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10.3, pg 5.10-17 The following potential mitigation strategies should also be listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibiting unnecessary idling of construction equipment. • Using low-sulfur fuel. • Locating diesel engines and motors as far away as possible from residential areas. • Locating staging areas as far away as possible from residential uses. • Requiring heavy construction equipment to use the cleanest available engines or to be retrofitted with diesel particulate control technology. 	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
294	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-19 The project area is no longer designated as an attainment/maintenance area for 8-hour O3. Needs to be corrected.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
295	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-19 to 26 Court Remands PM Transportation Conformity Hotspot Rule to EPA (December 11, 2007) – The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit remanded to EPA for further review a March 2006 final rule on hot spot analyses in project-level transportation conformity determinations for the new PM2.5 and existing PM10 NAAQS. Please include a qualitative analysis for PM2.5 following the guidance of: EPA420-B-06-902	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
296	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-20 Verify! The PM2.5 standard (98th %) is not necessarily the 2nd max concentration. Many urban monitors monitor daily or at 1-in-3 day frequency. At CAMP for example, over 325 daily samples are collected each year, which means the 6th or 7th max would be the 98th percentile NAAQS exceedance concentration.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
297	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-25 Clarify that the 2004 EAC was meant to comply with EPA's 1997 ozone standard.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
298	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.10, pg 5.10-32 EPA classifies this as the Denver Metropolitan/North Front Range Non-attainment Area.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
299	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.12 The noise impacts of alternatives 4 and 6 are less concerning because they would occur mostly in non-residential areas, whereas the noise impacts of the no-build and alternatives 1 and 3 would be greater in residential areas. It would be helpful to see a comparison of these impacts that explicitly shows the net difference between alternatives and 3 compared to 4 and 6.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
300	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.12, pg 5.12-1 At very bottom of page, Globeville and Montbello should not be included.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
301	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.12, pg 5.12-2, 3 There is no mention of the STAMINA Model's shortcomings such as the model's inability to account for multiple lanes, complex interchanges or viaducts. Also there is no mention of the TNM Model or that noise will ever be modeled using the TNM Model.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
302	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.12, pg 5.12-1 to 19 No mention anywhere of Construction Noise, Noise Variances or Chapter 36 "Noise Control" in chapter 5 "NOISE" of the I 70 East Draft Environmental Impact Statement Volume I.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
303	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 5, Section 5.14 Revise the boxed summary statement in section 5.14 to read: All build alternatives, including improvements proposed under the No-action Alternative, would require drainage improvements per local jurisdictions rules and regulations and stormwater quality per Urban Drainage Flood Control District Volume 3.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
304	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.16 Water Quality - Superseded versions of State of Colorado issued water quality regulations are referenced in several places in Section 5.16. Information associated with the superseded regulations is incorrect in some cases. Examples are: • Section 5.16.1, subsection on Reg. 31, page 5.16-2 Reg. 31 was most recently revised on 1/14/08. • Exhibit 5.16-3, page 5.16-3 Segment 14 of the South Platte River is no longer listed as impaired for E. coli (see 2008 version of Reg. 93). • Section 5.16.1, subsection on Reg. 94, page 5.16-4 A new version of Reg. 94 was issued in 2008 and should be referenced in place of the 2006 version.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
305	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.16.1, pg 5.16-2 The last sentence in the last paragraph in this section makes no sense. There are no State regulations specifically governing the Metro Wastewater Reclamation District's (Metro District) role with wastewater treatment in the Denver metropolitan area.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
306	3/31/2009	PW DES			Chapter 5, Section 5.16, pg 5.16-9 It should be clear that the criteria for water quality in the City and County of Denver - Public Works will be prescribed under the criteria for meeting the existing MS-4 permit and is not "existing conditions". Some discussion should be included referencing actions that would occur in accordance with the recent CDOT consent agreement. The following link will provide more info on consent agreement. http://www.dot.state.co.us/environmental/envWaterQual/default.asp	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
307	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.16.1, pg 5.16-19 to 20 Please also mention the Burlington Ditch Headgate which is a diversion structure located on the South Platte River about 0.5 miles downstream of I-70. The Diversion removes water from segment 14 of the South Platte River for use as drinking water for the City of Thornton. The City of Thornton has a drinking water treatment plant that treats water from the Burlington Ditch which could be affected by water quality impacts during construction.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
308	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.18 and HazMat Tech Report The Department of Environmental Health (DEH) has reviewed Section 5.18 of the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Draft Hazardous Material Technical Report (HMTR) for the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement. Information in the EIS and HMTR is based on a 2004 search of government databases. DEH understands that construction of the I-70 corridor may require several years and conditions related to hazardous materials may change; however, updates of the hazardous materials information are warranted given the remedial activities that have recently occurred at several locations along the I-70 corridor. Based on CDOT responses to earlier comments, an updated hazardous material location information will be included in the Final EIS.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
309	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.18 Figures in Section 5.18 of the Draft EIS and the HMTR should be updated. Extensive redevelopment of the former Stapleton International Airport has occurred. The redevelopment has resulted in numerous new roadways east of Quebec and west of Havana Street and north and south of I-70 that should be shown in Figures displaying the EIS Corridor.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
310	3/31/2009	DEH			Chapter 5, Section 5.20, pg 5.20-9 It is likely that sedimentation during construction of I-70 at the South Platte River would impact drinking water supplies for the City of Thornton. The City of Thornton takes water from Segment 14 of the South Platte River at the Burlington Ditch Headgate located approximately 0.5 miles downstream of I-70. For this reason extra care should be taken during construction to ensure that the selected BMPs to minimize impacts from construction on South Platte River water quality.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
311	3/31/2009	CPD			Chapter 5, Section 5.21 The relocation of existing businesses and industrial areas along the new alignment is a cumulative effect that the City sees as a positive trade-off in return for "offsetting] prior harm caused to these neighborhoods" by the loss of cohesion and other impacts created by the existing alignment.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
312	3/31/2009	PW DES			For alternative 1N, how does the WB off ramp to Brighton work with 46th? Does it merge/weave with 46th? Or is it a separate approach to Brighton? Or does WB 46th have to yield to the ramp traffic? If it is a merge/weave, is there enough room for to make the weave after the ramp and 46th get to the same grade?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
313	3/31/2009	PW DES			The proposed frontage roads in alternatives 1 and 3 need to be designed for two way traffic.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
314	3/31/2009	PW DES			In the alternative 1 and 3 south, with 45th stopping short of Steele, what are the impacts to the intersection of 44th and Steele?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
315	3/31/2009	PW DES			Dead-end public streets can not be created with your changes to the street grid. Provide a cul-de-sac at the end of all dead-ends that you create. i.e. where 45th stops short of Steele and where Madison stops short of 46th.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
316	3/31/2009	PW DES			Access from the 7-Eleven to 45th should not be provided because cars will cut through the parking lot to access the cut-off portion of 45th. Verify that gas trucks can still access the site with 45th going away.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
317	3/31/2009	PW DES			Are you acquiring the properties north of 45th that access Adams, Cook, and Madison? How will access to these properties be maintained? Particularly the properties that do not have 45th avenue frontage?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
318	3/31/2009	PW DES			In alternatives 1 and 3, I am concerned with the remaining access to the area at 44th and Garfield. The elimination of 46th in this area impacts the access in to this area. Can access from Madison be maintained?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
319	3/31/2009	PW DES			The impacts to the proposed North Metro station locations need to be factored in to your alternative analysis. Alternatives 4 and 6 impact the viability and access of both of the proposed station locations.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
320	3/31/2009	PW DES			The proposed gap in Brighton from 48 th to Race is a concern. How will this impact be mitigated? A more direct replacement for Brighton should be provided.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
321	3/31/2009	PW DES			Placing the traffic from Brighton on to 48th and then on to Race will cut-off the rec center and park from the neighborhood that it serves.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
322	3/31/2009	PW DES			The portion of Race that goes diagonally to the NW under the tracks is mislabeled. The diagonal section is really Race Court. The north-south section is Race Street.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
323	3/31/2009	PW DES			In alternatives 4 and 6, the WB off-ramp to Washington appears to be combined with 46th Avenue. We need more detail about how this would operate. 46th needs to be a two-way street in this area to serve the adjacent properties and the addition of the potentially higher speed interstate off-ramp traffic to this segment of 46th could impact that ability of 46th to serve the adjacent properties. Why can't the WB ramp to Washington remain where it is located now? In addition, how does the existing 46th bridge over the river and connection to Washington at 47th connect to this proposed 46th Avenue?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
324	3/31/2009	PW DES			In alternatives 4 and 6, I am confused about the proposed grade for the relocated I-70 near Race Court. Race Court currently is grade separated with Brighton and the Railroad. Race Street is at grade with Brighton. Is the proposed I-70 at-grade in this area? If so, then the relocated Brighton Boulevard and Race Street will need to be much lower than existing grade to provide the connection to Race Court. If not, and the proposed Brighton street is near its current grade, then it can not connect to Race Court as shown and a connection similar to the one currently at Race Court to Race Street should be provided.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
325	3/31/2009	PW DES			Appendix A, Section 11 Detention and Water Quality Facilities: Add discussion regarding the need for water quality storage all disturbed areas, this includes widening of roads and new roads.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
326	3/31/2009	PW DES			Appendix A, Section 11 Detention and Water Quality Facilities: Add Denver Inlet (No. 14 and 16 inlets) criteria to Table 4.a in Appendix A.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
327	3/31/2009	Division of Real Estate			ROW Tech Report Category R - Depending on route selected, the City & County of Denver and CDOT will need to have an IGA for maintenance of the corridor.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
328	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Technical Report Please revise the reference for Gregg Thomas and Debra Bain 2007 so that Thomas is listed as the principal author.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
329	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 4.0, pg 3, Line 25 Please describe the new ozone standard as was provided for PM.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
330	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.1, pg 6 Table 1 should be revised to show the 2008 75ppb 8-hr ozone standard.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
331	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.1, pg 6 Table 1 should show the 2008 0.15 ug/m3 rolling 3-month Pb standard.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
332	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.1, pg 6, Table 1 The 24-hr PM10 standard is not correctly characterized in the footnote. The correct footnote should read "Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years."	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
333	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.3, pg 9, line 8 The 1997 8-hr ozone standard was not exceeded at Welby, as this was a single exceedance and not the 3 year average of the 4th highest 8-hr max.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
334	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.3, pg 9, Table 3 The 1997 8-hr ozone standard was not exceeded at Welby, as this was a single exceedance and not an 8-hr max. Table 3 should be revised to show the 4th max, 3-yr (rolling) average concentrations and should include 2007 and 2008. Monitors whose values exceed the 2008 75ppb 8-hr standard should be denoted.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
335	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.3, pg 9, Table 3 The 98th percentile concentration is only the 2nd max when monitoring is on a 1-in-6 day frequency. For PM2.5, CAMP and Swansea monitor daily, which means there could be up to 7 allowable exceedances per year. The listed values in the table need to reflect the 98th percentile concentration based on the sampling frequency at that monitor (CDPHE can help with this or EPA's AQS website can be accessed).	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
336	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.1.3, pg 9 Table 3 should also include data from the Carriage Air Monitoring site (23rd Ave & Julian St). This monitor will show several additional 8-hr avg ozone exceedances.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
337	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.2.1, pg 15 Figure 3 does not make sense. It states that "smooth flow reduces emissions by a factor of nearly 20." However, the HC emissions graphed appear to range from ~17.5-19.5, which is not even a factor of 2 reduction. This graph appears to be pulled from the UC Davis paper and is not presented in the correct context.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
338	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.2.1, pgs 16-17, line 23 It is not appropriate to compare risk assessment for behavioral risks (alcohol consumption) to environmental risks (urban air pollution). Moreover, the "J-shaped" dose response relationship for alcohol consumption is not relevant to MSAT exposure. This paragraph should be omitted or a more appropriate example of observable exposures and responses should be utilized.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
339	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 5.2.2.1, pgs 18, line 38 The Jerritt citation "exposures assigned on distance to traffic or traffic counts near the home are prone to . . . errors . . . and biased results" should be revised such that the reviewer can be confident that with the omissions it is still contextually correct.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
340	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 7.1.3, pg 25, line 33 Court Remands PM Transportation Conformity Hotspot Rule to EPA (December 11, 2007) – The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit remanded to EPA for further review a March 2006 final rule on hot spot analyses in project-level transportation conformity determinations for the new PM2.5 and existing PM10 NAAQS. Please include a qualitative analysis for PM2.5 following the guidance of: EPA420-B-06-902	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
341	3/31/2009	DEH			<p>Air Quality Tech Report, Section 7.2.6, pg 43, Line 1</p> <p>There have been previous PM construction monitoring efforts associated with I-70/Brighton Blvd and the T-REX project. The data is available, and it shows that CDOT violated the PM10 annual NAAQS for 3 straight yrs at 44th&Brighton and also violated the 24 hr NAAQS in 2001 & 2002. Since construction of the highway is likely to be of the greatest concern to the community, this really needs to be a focal point for CDOT and FHWA. T-REX data was better, with no monitored NAAQS violations. Relying on past monitoring data for construction is much more useful than materials volume surrogates. CDOT was asked several years ago by the Air Quality Committee to report the monitored data from the previous I-70 work. The data should be reported in this document, with the necessary caveats. CDPHE and Denver have this info and should be consulted prior to the public version being released to discuss future monitoring guidelines due to the immediate proximity of sensitive receptors.</p>	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
342	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 7.3, pg 45, lines 8-14 Terms like modestly and minimal should be avoided. Just say "emissions are expected to be <10% higher than" I would strike the last sentence. You do not conduct ozone modeling so this statement is purely speculation.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
343	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 7.3, pg 45, line 19 flattening of improvements should be revised so that it is clear you are referring to "maximum fleet penetration of vehicles with catalytic converters."	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
344	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 7.3, pg 45, line 26-29 Verify! The PM2.5 standard (98th %) is not necessarily the 2nd max concentration. Many urban monitors monitor daily or at 1-in-3 day frequency. At CAMP for example, over 325 daily samples are collected each year, which means the 6th or 7th max would be the 98th percentile NAAQS exceedance concentration. Table 3 on pg 9 needs to be updated to reflect the 98th percentile as reported by CDPHE or the EPA AQS database.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
345	3/31/2009	DEH			Air Quality Tech Report, Section 9.0, pg 49, line 1 Please revise the reference for Gregg Thomas and Debra Bain 2007 so that Thomas is listed as the principal author.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
346	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Technical Report & General Comment on DEIS Regarding Traffic Impacts The I-70 EIS November 2008 version appears to be identical to the 2007 pre-draft version reviewed by Denver. Therefore, the following comments on the Draft Traffic Technical Report are still valid for the current Traffic Report. Furthermore, we understand that additional analysis would be necessary to address the traffic impacts associated with 46th Avenue for Alternatives 4 & 6, for evaluation and consideration as a preferred alternative in the FEIS. Denver is willing and ready to evaluate the benefits and impacts of the re-alignment alternatives and 46th Avenue with CDOT and FHWA.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
347	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Overall The FEIS should use the DRCOG 2035 regional travel demand model in lieu of the DRCOG 2030 version. Please update report to base on this 2035 model.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
348	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 3.2, pg 27, line 7-10 Need to indicate 2003 traffic counts are substantially lower than 2007 counts. 2007 Peoria counts are 2 to 3 times those shown in the 2003 counts.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
349	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 3.2, pgs 28-30 In Figures 20, 21 and 22, why are Quebec counts not included in this study and why are the ramp intersection volumes not shown? Please provide these volume.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
350	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 3.3.1, pg 34 In Figures 23, 24 and 25, indicate that all intersection LOS are much lower for current 2007 current traffic volume than shown for the 2003 traffic volume.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
351	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 3.5, pg 49-51 In Figures 32, 33 and 34, please include future 2030 traffic volume on all ramp intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
352	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.1.2.3, pg 67, lines 39-47 With a projected 40,000 ADT on 46th Avenue, Alt 4 or 6 built alternatives, requires a minimum of 6 lanes with left turn pockets at signalized intersections. Especially with the high truck traffic percentages on 46th Avenue to service the warehouse distribution centers along I-70.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
353	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.1.4.1, pg 73, lines 40-43 Should retain the on- and off- ramp to I-70 at Monaco.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
354	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.1.4.3, pg 74, lines 40-43 In paragraph seems to reference the alt 1 and 3 built alternative, not alt 4 as per 6.1.4.3.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
355	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.2.1, pg 76-78 In Figures 38, 39 and 40, need to include projected 2030 traffic volumes on all ramp intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
356	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.2.3, pg 83, line 25-27 Again, 46th Avenue must be a 6 lanes arterial to be able to handle 40,000 plus ADT.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
357	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.2.3, pg 85-87 In Figures 44, 45 and 46, need to include projected 2030 traffic volumes on all ramp intersections and at 46th Avenue signalized intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
358	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.2.4, pg 89-91 In Figures 47, 48 and 49, need to include projected 2030 traffic volumes on all ramp intersections and at 46th Avenue signalized intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
359	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.2.5, pg 92, line 12-14 Again, 46th Avenue must be a 6 lanes arterial to be able to handle 40,000 plus ADT.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
360	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.1.1, pg 95-96 In Figures 50, 51, 52 and 53, it is difficult to see how the ramp intersections will have LOS C's or D's with 2000 to 3000 directional peak traffic volume. Please provide details	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
361	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.1.2, pg 99, line 2 Do you mean alternative 3?	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
362	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.1.3, pg 103-104 In Figures 58, 59, 60 and 61, it is difficult to see how the ramp intersections will have LOS C's or D's with 2000 to 3000 directional peak traffic volume. Please provide details	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
363	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.1.4, pg 106-108 In Figures 62, 63, 64 and 65, it is difficult to see how the ramp intersections will have LOS C's or D's with 2000 to 3000 directional peak traffic volume. Please provide details	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
364	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.3, pg 119, line 6-7 Please provide details of these improvements at these ramp intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
365	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.7.3, pg 138, line 9-11 Will not be able to adequately service these intersections - Dahlia/Holly/Monaco at 46th Avenue while the frontage road exists. Only solution is to remove the frontage roads and incorporate into the new 46th Avenue redesign.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
366	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.3.8, pg 139-140 Need to provide details of local north-south roadway mitigations.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
367	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.4, pg 143, line 9-11 46th Avenue must be a 6 lanes facility in order to service 40,000 plus ADT.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
368	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.4, pg 143, line 12-17 Will not be able to adequately service these intersections - Dahlia/Holly/Monaco at 46th Avenue while the frontage road exists. Only solution is to remove the frontage roads and incorporate into the new 46th Avenue redesign.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen

No.	DATE	Agency (as needed)	NAME		Comments or questions about the DEIS (Please note that comments that included attachments are linked within this PDF).	Comment submitted via
			Last	First		
369	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report, Section 6.4, pg 143 Need to have summary on local ramp intersections.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
370	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report Please explain the existing of 145,500 ADT on Tower Rd as shown in page 30 of the Traffic Technical Report and on page 4-5 on the EIS chapter 4.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
371	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report If alternatives 3 or 4 are selected, 46th Avenue is proposed to be build to a 4 lanes roadway (2 EB and 2 WB). TES will want assurance that the ROW on 46th Avenue will not preclude TES to reconstruction 46th Avenue to a 6 lanes facility. Please note in the technical report and the EIS chapter 4 that 46th Avenue will have ample ROW so TES can fit a 6 lanes onto 46th Avenue.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
372	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report TES object to the construction of 46th Avenue between the frontage roads (Stapleton Drive North and South) between Colorado Blvd and Quebec Street. Stapleton Drive North and Stapleton Drive South must be incorporated into the 46th Avenue redesign.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
373	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report TES will not allow three signals in a 300 feet roadway section – Stapleton Drive North, 46th Avenue and Stapleton Drive South at Dahlia. Only one signal is allow – therefore, eliminate the frontage roads and incorporate these roads into the 46th Avenue redesign.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
374	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report Likewise, only one signal is allow at Stapleton Drive North/46th Avenue/Stapleton Drive South at Holly and also at Stapleton Drive North/46th Avenue/Stapleton Drive South at Monaco.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
375	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report Regardless of which alternatives are selected, greater details of proposed improvements shall be required at all interchange intersections – especially at Brighton Blvd, Steele/Vasquez, Colorado, Quebec, Havana, and Peoria.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
376	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report Bridge structures at Brighton, Steele/Vasquez, Colorado, Quebec, Havana and Peoria will need to be modified and widen to provide greater capacities to the city's roadway to handle higher volumes.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen
377	3/31/2009	PW TES			Traffic Tech Report Greater signal upgrade details shall need to be provided at all interchange intersections. Quebec/I-70 and Peoria/I-70 are good examples that signal redesign shall be to be address.	matrix submitted with letter sent via email to C. Horn and J. Bemelen